00111222

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 26 March, 2016

LEARNING AND WORKING.

SIX LECTURES

DELIVERED IN WILLIS'S ROOMS, LONDON, IN JUNE AND JULY, 1854.

B-9 36

THE RELIGION OF ROME,

AND

ITS INFLUENCE ON MODERN CIVILIZATION.

FOUR LECTURES

DELIVERED IN THE PHILOSOPHICAL INSTITUTION OF EDINBURGH, IN DECEMBER, 1854.

BY

FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE, M.A.

CHAPLAIN OF LINCOLN'S INN.

Cambridge:

MACMILLAN & CO.

1855.

GOA

37H · OH

Mall/Lea

111222

Rep 27H · 5632

00111222

111222

TO

JOHN MALCOLM LUDLOW, ESQ.

BARRISTER, LINCOLN'S INN.

My dear Friend,

A letter, which I received from you early in the year 1848, when you had seen Paris immediately after the expulsion of the Orleans family, had a very powerful effect upon my thoughts at the time, and has given a direction to them ever since. I understood from it, better than I had ever done before, how hollow that material civilization was, of which Louis Philippe had been the great promoter in France, and which we had been well inclined to adopt and to worship in England. I felt, far more than I had ever done before, how much it was the duty of every man, but, above all,

of every clergyman, to stri e that the principle and power of Christian civilization, which is not based upon selfishness, which does not make the accumulation of material treasures or the increase of material enjoyments its main objects, might be recognised in the past history of Europe, and especially of our own country,—might influence and determine its future condition. We knew well how little you and I could do to counteract the evil, or bring forth the good, that is working in our time. But we knew also, that what we could do, we were bound to do. And I believe that in looking back upon the seven years that have elapsed since, we have both often felt bitter self-reproach, in considering how much more even we might have done, if we had followed the light which was granted us, to prevent the blessing of God's great judgments from being lost to our country,—how much we have shared in the sin of the rulers who, while those judgments were in the earth, did not learn righteousness, but returned, after a moment of terror, to their crooked ways. Nevertheless, I can truly say, that not only every task

in which we have been engaged together, but that every sermon or lecture that I have delivered in the exercise of my own vocation, almost every thought I have thought, has been shaped and coloured by the conviction which you helped to awaken in me.

Amidst many differences of opinion about the course which Christian civilization took in former days, and respecting that direction which is most suitable for our age, we have agreed, I think I may say it confidently, in one or two practical conclusions. We have neither of us ever doubted that the whole country must look for its blessings through the elevation of its Working Class, that we must all sink if that is not raised. We have never dreamed that that class could be benefited, by losing its working character, by acquiring habits of ease or self-indulgence. We have rather thought that *all* must learn the dignity of labour and the blessing of self-restraint. We could not talk to suffering men of intellectual or moral improvement, without first taking an interest in their physical condition and their ordinary occupations;

but we felt that any interest of this kind would be utterly wasted, that it would do harm and not good, if it were not the means of leading them to regard themselves as human beings made in the image of God. We have never thought that we could help them to be individually wise or individually good, if we forgot that they were social beings, bound to each other by the ties of family, neighbourhood, country, and by a common humanity. We have never thought that we could make them understand what that common humanity means, or even what is implied in any of those subordinate relations, unless we could speak to them of a Son of Man in whom they have a common interest. We have believed that in order to do that, we must go deeper still, that the Son of Man must be the Son of God, that there is no Brotherhood for human beings if there is not a common Fatherhood.

These thoughts are so familiar to you, and to all with whom I am in the habit of conversing, that you would not suppose it possible for me to conceal them, on whatever topic I was speaking or writing. They present themselves, not very

obtrusively, in this volume. But you will feel at once that they lie at the ground of everything which is contained in it. They connect together two sets of Lectures, which were delivered for very different purposes, to very different audiences, but which, it seems to me, bring out two aspects of the same subject.

The first set has reference to the Working-men's College, in which I have the honour and satisfaction to be a fellow-labourer with you. After we had laid our plan, you and others thought it would be desirable that I should state it and explain it, not only to the Working-people, (which I did afterwards in an Inaugural Lecture,) but to such an audience as was likely to meet at Willis's Rooms. Addressing myself to such persons, I was naturally anxious to show that we were engaged in no novel experiment; that we were carrying out a principle which had been recognised in all periods of our history, and of the history of modern Europe; that to the acknowledgment of it we owed most of the education and civilization which the upper and middle classes

of England possessed; that the forgetfulness and denial of it was not merely leading to the ruin of the lower classes, but would end in the ruin of all; that the humane education of our Colleges will become inhuman, narrow, worthless, if we do not recognise the most precious subjects of education as those which are common to men; that the difficulties which hinder the union of Learning with manual Work, are difficulties which must be faced, because they interfere with the freedom, order, civilization of England now and in the times to come. This, with a general outline of our own particular plan, and a few hints as to the feasibility of it in other places besides the one we have chosen for our experiment, and in other hands than ours, forms the material of the first six Lectures.

The title of the other four was determined by some Edinburgh friends who did me the honour of asking me to appear in the same rooms in which Mr. Ruskin delivered his Lectures on Architecture, and our friend Kingsley his on Alexandria. It was a distinction and a misfortune to follow

such men; and the 'Religion of Rome' is probably a less inviting topic than that which it had fallen to the lot of either of them to discuss. But I was thankful for the selection, because it led me more earnestly to meditate on that other principle of Christian civilization to which I have alluded, and to see how it is implied in the existence of modern society. Whatever there was mighty in the Roman institutions, whatever there was sincere and earnest in the Roman religion, had its basis, I believe, in the fatherly authority. That was the truth to which the Republic owed its greatness. It lasted on in strange alliance with a principle which was always contradicting it in the Empire. Polytheism overlaid it, but could not stifle it. The loss of it was the decline and fall of Rome. Christianity came in, to place it on its true and eternal foundation, to make it practical for mankind. Because the Greek and Asiatic cities never took hold of it, their civilization, after trying to unite with Christianity, perished along with their Christianity. The civilization of Western Europe has depended upon it, has expressed it in

every name, institution, revolution,—in the Roman Bishops who assumed to be the fathers of Christendom,—in the German reverence for the family, which rose up against them. To assert a divine, true Fatherhood, in place of the paternal tyrannies which have counterfeited it, must, I conceive, be the work of those who would educate and civilize the nations in the way in which they never have been educated and civilized, and never can be, by those who merely seek, even with the utmost skill, to cultivate their material prosperity, at the expense of their inward life.

I hope this statement will remove something of the natural surprise which you expressed, when I told you that I meant to combine these courses of Lectures in one volume. There are other bonds of connexion between them, in my mind, of a more sad and sacred kind. Both alike were delivered in a year which will be memorable as one of suffering, honour, and disgrace in our national annals. Both of them are to me most deeply associated with personal affections and personal sorrows. Since I began to prepare these

Lectures for the press, one who listened with the most cordial sympathy to the first course, who would have been the best judge of the second,—one from whom I learned more than from almost any, and who especially taught me how possible it is to unite vehement and earnest feeling, and an extreme dislike of eclectical accommodations with an abhorrence of party names and narrowness,—has ended his work upon earth, has begun, as I believe, freer and nobler works, more helpful to us here, than any which were possible whilst he was amongst us. No one took a deeper interest in our College, or hoped more from it. More recently a member of our own Council has been taken from us; one very dear to you and dear to me, to whom men of science looked for great discoveries in the study to which he was sacrificed; who, we knew, had aims which no physical science could satisfy. In our College and in all our tasks, may we work as those who are cheered on by the voices of invisible friends! And when the clouds that overhang our country are thickest, and men who are worthy to be

trusted appear to be the fewest, may we be able to hope that God will do His own work, and out of those who are lowest in human eyes,—our *common* people,—will raise up citizens that will be fit to live and die for England, if not to rule her.

Ever your affectionate Friend,

F. D. MAURICE.

PREFACE.

THE Working-men's College, in Red Lion Square, which the first six Lectures in this volume were intended to announce, was opened at the beginning of last November. About 140 pupils entered the different classes. The entire number has not varied much in the second term. The classes which were most frequented in the first term, were those on Algebra and Arithmetic, the English Grammar class, the Drawing class, and the Bible class. The class on Geometry was well attended. Those on Politics, Geography, History, and certain parts of Practical Jurisprudence, attracted a few students, whose diligence compensated for the smallness of their numbers. Classes on Mechanics and Astronomy had some pupils in the last term, none in this, chiefly because the teachers evinced a great desire that their pupils should have a previous training in Mathematics. The lecturer on the human frame, who had no pupils in the first term, has three in this. Classes have been opened since Christmas in French and Latin, which have been very popular. An Evening Adult School, to prepare pupils for the College in reading, writing, and arithmetic, is increasing in numbers every week.

Whether the partial success which we have to be thankful for, is to disappear, or to be permanent; whether the pupils are to feel that they are really members of a College united together for high ends by other than mercenary bonds; whether they shall feel that they are learning principles, instead of merely acquiring a few scraps of miscellaneous information, must depend mainly upon the teachers, upon the principles which govern their thoughts and acts, upon the fellowship and mutual understanding which there is among them. Since these Lectures were delivered, some have joined our body, whose cooperation we had no right to count upon, but who have given us their most cordial and persevering assistance. Mr. Ruskin has procured for our Drawing class a reputation that has been reflected on the whole society, of which it forms a most important part. I would not insult him, or any of my colleagues, by expressing any wonder or gratitude that they have undertaken tasks, which, I am sure, bring the most abundant reward with them; but I do thank them, one and all, for giving the best pledge which they could give of zeal in the cause of the Working-men, in that they have not shrunk from associating themselves with a person from whom many of them differ widely in opinion, and whose name can bring them nothing but discredit with the world.

My only claim to be the temporary guide of men who are my superiors in nearly every accomplishment, is, that I am a little older than any of them, and that circumstances have given me a more lengthened, though certainly not a more honourable, acquaintance

with Colleges of one class and another, than has fallen to their lot. It happens, by a strange accident, that I have been a member of both our Universities,—that I resided at both for a considerable time as an Undergraduate, — and that, therefore, though I may have had less opportunity of intercourse with the eminent Doctors in them than many, I have been brought into close contact with different classes of the younger men, and with some of those whose thoughts were most stirring and characteristic of the times. Afterwards I had the honour of being connected, for thirteen years, with a College established especially for the benefit of the Middle-classes in London and in the country generally,—and that in two capacities, as a teacher of those who were preparing themselves for the larger Universities, or for the business of the world, and as a teacher of those who were destined to be parochial Clergymen, generally in poor and humble neighbourhoods. Now, though it is quite possible to have passed through this discipline without being the least qualified for the very responsible work of directing the studies of a body of Working-men, my friends may, perhaps, be excused for setting it off against deficiencies in other respects, and I for supposing that such a preparation is not given one for nothing, and that he who has received it is bound to consider how he may best turn it to account.

That all the gifts which any have received through one instrumentality or another, all general knowledge, all professional knowledge,—and that which we may be rich in if we are poor in these, experience of our own

failures and errors, of the wrongs we have done, of the good we have missed,—should be turned to the service of that class which is, indeed, not a class, but which represents the stuff of humanity after class distinctions have been removed from it,—in which lie the germs of the worst evil, and of the best good, that is in any of the classes,—the worst evils of which are rarely to bear fruit, the best good of which may be, by God's grace, made more productive than any seeds which were sown in any past generations have proved to be:—this is the doctrine that I have maintained in the Lectures on Learning and Working, and which I trust also will receive illustration from those on the Old and Modern Civilization, though they were delivered in another country and for another purpose. I have referred continually to the older Universities, because it seems to me that they are passing through a crisis, which will decide whether they are to perish, or to become immeasurably greater blessings to the nation than they have ever been; and that the first of these results will be inevitable, if they attach a vulgar, exclusive, caste signification to the divine, humane, physical lore which it is their function to diffuse; that they may be certain of obtaining the second, if they feel that their business is to awaken in the noble, in the scholar, and in the peasant, that manhood which each loses when it does not recognise the presence of it in the other. We ask them to aid in delivering us from the cold hard officiality which is cramping all our energies, destroying all our hearts, and which the modern plans for improving official promotions and

removing corruptions, unless they are sustained by some better and purer influences, will, I fear, rather foster than check. It will avail nothing to offer prizes to men of all conditions: such a scheme may create a race of nimble clerks, it will form no seers and statesmen,—if you do not set before the people of England some standard of worth, such as no prizes ever taught them to contemplate,—if you do not offer them some sincere knowledge, such as prizes often tempt them to exchange for what is most glossy and superficial. Let the skilful quill-driver have his reward, (indeed, who has more rewards already?) but if we want to create heroes, or to save them from perishing when we have them, let those who used to boast that they existed to form English gentlemen, show that their occupation is not gone; only that they believe gentleness is not tied to wealth, not even to birth; that God can cultivate it, and would cultivate it, in the collier and the street-sweeper.

These words are addressed expressly to those, no longer young, whom I have known and cared for at our Universities, and to those who have taken their places there. I am also bound to say something to those whom I have myself had a share in educating, and to whose kindness I owe more than I can express. I have broken a promise in the letter which some of them were so good as to draw from me, that I would reproduce some fragments of Lectures I once gave them on English Literature; I believed I should keep the spirit of it better, if I could show them how they might carry out in practice the principles

which I endeavoured to set forth in those Lectures. They had, in my opinion, one merit, and only one. They were formed upon the belief that all history and all literature exhibit God's education of mankind; that the history and literature of England exhibit the education of our people and of ourselves. I enforced this principle till I have no doubt my hearers were tired of what seemed to them an endless repetition. If, on looking back to the time we spent together, they have forgiven that fault, and the want of information and liveliness which they must have detected since they became acquainted with other teachers, it must be because they have felt that truth to be one, which however it was uttered and expounded, is needful for our time, and becomes alive when it is acted out. This I am sure is a right judgment; therefore, if I can help them to act, if I can point out to them a course of action, I am giving them the old Lectures revised and corrected, with the very commentary which they missed when they were first delivered. Let them understand that God has been educating them to educate their brethren of the working-class, and all that they learnt, all that they are still learning, all the work of their professions or trades, will acquire a new character, will be valued as it has never been valued before, will be changed from a weight into a power—from the routine of a machine, into the onward movement of a spirit. These former pupils will recognise in my Edinburgh Lectures much of what I was trying to say to them, only in a different form, and carried back into the old world. I spoke to them of the Divine education which

had been granted to modern Europe. Here I have traced this education to the cradle, in which we have often wondered that a child, destined to such a great inheritance, could have been rocked. If I have shown that it was not neglected, but carefully tended even then, I may have removed some little perplexity from the mind of the modern as well as the classical student; I may have afforded one more illustration of the inseparable connexion which there is between their respective pursuits. I hope, that in doing so, I may have shown why Lectures that bear directly on business should be combined with Lectures on a subject of scientific inquiry. If the business does not rest on scientific truth, it can be good for nothing; if the science does not lead to practice, it cannot deserve its name. A College—a Working-men's College especially—ought to exist, that it may manifest their essential unity.*

* It may throw light on some of the statements in the Lectures and in this Preface, if I insert the programme of our studies for the last Term:—

TIME.	P.M.	SUBJECT.	TEACHER.
Sunday . .	8½–10	The Gospel of St. John	THE PRINCIPAL.
Monday . .	8—9	The Structure and Functions of the Human Body	MR. WALSH.
,,	8—9	Algebra,[1] (*Section* 2)	MR. LITCHFIELD.
,,	8—9	Natural Philosophy: *Mechanics* .	MR. WATSON.
,,	9–10	English Political Writers: *Sixteenth Century*	THE PRINCIPAL.
Tuesday . .	8—9	Geometry	MR. HOSE.
,,	8—9	French	M. TALANDIER.
,,	9–10	English Grammar, (*Section* 2) .	MR. FURNIVALL.
Wednesday.	8—9	Political Economy	MR. NEALE.
,,	8—9	Algebra,[1] (*Section* 2)	MR. LITCHFIELD.

[1] The treatment of the subject in this Section will embrace the principles and practice of *Arithmetic*.

TIME.	P.M.	SUBJECT.	TEACHER.
Wednesday.	8—9	Natural Philosophy: *Astronomy*.	Mr. Locock.
„	9–10	Latin	Mr. Irving.
Thursday .	7—9	Drawing	Mr. Ruskin, Mr. Rossetti, & Mr. Dickinson.
„	8—9	English Grammar (*Section* 1) . .	Mr. Furnivall.
„	8—9	Natural Philosophy: *Mechanics*.	Mr. Watson.
„	8—9	Sanitary Legislation	Mr. Hughes.
„	9–10	Geometry	Mr. Hose.
„	9–10	Structure and Derivations of English Words	Mr. Furnivall.
„	9–10	The Law of Joint Stock Companies	Mr. Ludlow.
Friday . . .	8—9	The Geography of England as connected with its History .	Mr. Brewer.
„	8—9	French	M. Talandier.
„	9–10	The Reign of King Richard II. illustrated by Shakspeare's Play	The Principal.
Saturday .	8–10	Algebra, (*Section* 1)	Mr. Westlake.

It has been arranged that ultimately the College should be divided into five classes. The first will consist of the general body of Matriculated Students; the second, of Students who obtain a certificate of competency in some one branch of study after they have attended the College for four terms; the third, of Associated Students, who shall prove that they have a competent knowledge in the principal subjects of our teaching, no effort being made to elicit their opinions, but a reasonable knowledge of Scripture History, of English History, of the principles of English Grammar, and of either Geometry or Algebra, being considered indispensable. The fourth class will consist of Fellows, that is, of persons chosen out of the Associates, who shall be considered morally and intellectually capable of assisting in the education of the Students. The fifth class will contain the Council, which it is proposed should be recruited from the Fellows. These arrangements may admit of modifications; but they are the basis of a scheme which we trust will give solidity and unity to our society.

CONTENTS.

LEARNING AND WORKING.

	PAGE
LECTURE I.—Juvenile and Adult Learning	3
II.—Learning and Leisure	39
III.—Learning and Money Worship incompatible	72
IV.—Learning the Minister of Freedom and Order	99
V.—The Studies in a Working College . .	129
VI.—The Teachers in a Working College . .	159
NOTES	192

THE RELIGION OF ROME.

PAGE

LECTURE I.—Rome in its Youth 205

II.—Rome under Greek Teachers 239

III.—Rome at the Beginning of the New World 275

IV.—The Influence of Rome and Germany upon Modern Europe 311

NOTES 347

LEARNING AND WORKING.

LECTURE I.

JUVENILE AND ADULT LEARNING.

FIFTEEN years ago I delivered some Lectures in this room on the subject of Education. I refer to them that I may better explain to you the motives which have induced me to commence the present course.

At that time some earnest men, with one or two of whom I had the honour to be acquainted, were striving to make the ecclesiastical machinery which they found in this country, effectual for the education of its people. They believed that that was the design for which it existed, and that if it failed of accomplishing that design, the Clergy and the laity of the upper classes in England were guilty of a sin for which they would have to answer. They thought that we had powers to do the work, if we knew them and would use them. They thought also that no machinery, though it might be the best in the world, could be of the least avail, if we did not understand that this power was not a mechanical but a moral one. I could give very little help to those who were attempting to carry these convictions into practice; but I fancied that I might be able to

impress them on the minds of a few in whom they would bear fruit, and that I might perhaps lead those who were engaged in a great work to reflect more deeply on the principle that was involved in it, so that it should not become, as all work is liable to become, servile drudgery, but should continue intelligent and manly as the hearts of those were who had devoted themselves to it.

As I should not have ventured in 1839 to discuss the principles of Education, unless there had been some practical undertaking to which they could be applied, and by which they could be tested, so neither in the year 1854 have I acquired that courage. I should be more afraid than I was then of merely laying down general maxims upon this subject, because I think I know a little, a very little, more of the facts with which we have to deal. Now, as before, an experiment is about to be made, which must be submitted to a searching examination, which will be good for nothing if it is pursued ever so zealously but not in conformity with sound principles. The experiment is altogether different in kind from that of which I have spoken. It does not aim at restoring or invigorating an old organization. It does not start from any consideration respecting the powers of the Church or of the State. It does not contemplate men as divided from each other by certain circumstances of property or position, into rich or poor, or into the upper class, the middle class, the lower class. It simply looks at the fact, that the great bulk of the people in this country, those in whom its strength lies, want an instruction which they have not got. It views them in

reference, not to their station but to their occupations. The scheme I speak of, is a College for Working Men. *A College*, that is to say, a society constituted for the purpose of communicating and receiving a methodical education; for *Working-men*, that is to say, for grown-up people spending their lives in business, not for children or boys who are merely preparing themselves for business.

You will perceive at once, that a project of this kind is free from *some* of the difficulties which tormented the prosecutors of the other plan at every step. Those who attempt to found a Working College will not have to ask that revenues which have been turned for years or centuries to another use, should be reclaimed to theirs. If they succeed at all, they will not be founding or renewing a charity; they will be offering that which free-men must take and pay for if they wish to have it. They avoid the question, who may or may not provide the education; assuming that any persons, even the most insignificant, may make the offer, and that the working-men themselves will decide at whose hands and under what conditions they will accept it. In another respect they resemble their predecessors. Actual complaints of the inefficiency of our spiritual organization, and eager demands *that it might be* destroyed, led them to exclaim, 'Let us *try if* we 'cannot turn it to account.' We hear on all sides of us lamentations over the moral and intellectual condition of the Working Classes. We are not forcing people's attention upon facts which they have agreed to disregard; we are dwelling upon those which a

majority profess to think the most important of all. And the scheme itself which we propose has no novelty in it. A number of previous experiments have been made in the same direction. The effort to provide some kind of teaching for working men out of working hours, is perhaps the most characteristic effort of this time. Nevertheless, I am certain that if these or any other considerations lead those who are putting forward this plan to fancy that it is an easy one—that the objections to it are not deeper and more radical than any which can have been raised against the other—they have not counted the cost of their undertaking, and will have to learn from experience that which they might have understood from reflection.

The first and most fundamental of these objections presents itself in this form: 'We find it hard enough 'to satisfy ourselves about the right method of bringing 'up boys and girls. We have been discussing schemes 'of instruction indefatigably. We have our English 'schemes, our French schemes, our German schemes; 'schemes of Statesmen, schemes of Churchmen, schemes 'of Voluntaries. Almost every town, parish, hamlet, 'has its own scheme. Nearly every man and woman 'has something to say against the scheme of his or her 'neighbour. Those who have been most earnest on the 'subject often begin to be most hopeless of any agree-'ment upon it, the most discontented with the results 'which they witness. And yet these plans refer to 'those who have as yet no prejudices of their own, who 'are ready to receive impressions, from whom the im-'pressions they have received may be effaced, for whom

'almost any sort of teaching or discipline would seem to 'be better than none. And now having failed or 'succeeded very imperfectly, with these, you propose to 'try your hand upon those who are hardened by use and 'custom, whose facility of receiving what you would 'impart has been diminished by every year in which 'they have been without it, whose power and inclination 'to resist that which you would impart has been in-'creased by every year which has given a hard definite 'mould to their characters and purposes; who, in addition 'to all the obstructions which meet you in the case of 'the education of children from the contradictions of sects 'and classes, oppose the weight of uncultivated intellects 'and of stubborn, impracticable wills. Because you 'have been wearied with the footmen, you would contend 'with the horsemen. You are nearly in despair of 'making your children into men, and therefore you 'would attempt the promising task of making your men 'into children.'

I state the objection as strongly as I can, because I feel it to be most strong. No theories, no calculations of what might be good for our people, can overthrow it; facts, I think, may show that it must be encountered, however mighty it is. The difficulties, you say, which beset us in the teaching of boys and girls are serious enough. Yes; and are they not of this kind? Do you not find that when you have got your schoolroom built according to the most approved model, and the system of instruction, whatever it be, set on foot, you cannot keep your boys and girls in the schoolroom working out this system, after a very early age indeed? Do you

not find that the bribes which you can offer them to stay are powerless, in comparison with those which lead their parents to send them into the field, or into the factory, or into service? Do you not find it the hardest of all problems to solve, how you shall influence them afterwards? These are not occasional or local grievances; you hear of them from the agricultural village and the manufacturing town, from the parish curate and the dissenting minister, from the schoolmistress as much as the schoolmaster.

I quite admit that the Government measure for the encouragement of pupil-teachers has done something, and may do more, to abate this evil. I cannot doubt for a moment that that is a step in the right direction. It is in that very direction into which I am seeking to lead you. It is connected with that valuable movement for the foundation of training-schools, which arose from the discovery that school-houses, school-machinery, even a multitude of scholars, are not the things which we most want. It belongs to a class of measures which involve the principle, that unless there be an education for adults, there will in a short time be none that is worth having for children.

I believe this conclusion is also forced upon us in another way. It may be true that we have answered all the arguments with which farmers or country-gentlemen were wont to assail our phantasies about teaching the poor. Any one who sets deliberately about the task of refuting them may be accused, with great plausibility, of fighting with ghosts or windmills. But after all, some of these dead arguments start to life again and

present themselves in very questionable shapes. 'Your 'learning,' it was said, 'will not fit boys and girls for 'doing their work.' We thought the suspicion exceedingly absurd. But surely we are often obliged to ask ourselves when no one is within hearing, Does it? Is there any direct and manifest connexion between the business of the school and the business of the world, between the books and the life? I trust in many cases there is a strong and obvious connexion, one which makes itself felt in all the doings of the boy or girl who come from the school, one which proves that there are thoughts in them which, but for that early discipline, would never have been awakened. It would be sad indeed if one did not believe this. But there is certainly an impression abroad which is shared by some of the most zealous supporters of popular education, that our schools for the poor, whatever other benefits have come from them, are not bringing up helpful intelligent workers, that from some accident or other their learning and work stand altogether apart from each other, so that the best scholar may sometimes almost seem to have had the faculties dulled and stunted, which he needs for the toils in which he must be engaged. If this is the case, we ought to know it and confess it. If those who prophesied such a result think they have won a triumph, by all means let them enjoy it. Not for one single instant would we fall back into their habit of thinking, because it was grounded upon the assumption that poor people were sent into the world to work for *them*, and that all which had to be considered was, how they might be made into the handiest tools for their purposes. But

though we abjure their doctrine, we may turn their practical experience to account, so far as it serves for the exposure and correction of our own mistakes. We ought freely to admit, that any education which fails to make poor men or rich men efficient in action, is an unsatisfactory education,—one which needs to be reformed, not only for the sake of its results, but because the studies which produce such results cannot themselves be sincere and wholesome.

But I should be distrustful of this evidence, if it was only drawn from the condition of one class in the country. I think there are proofs that it has as much to do with our highest education as with our lowest. A bill, you all know, is now under discussion in Parliament, and is likely to become law, which proposes to alter the constitution of the University of Oxford. The form which this proposition has taken, is certainly not that which it would have taken twenty or thirty years ago. Then it was supposed that the old Universities required to be reformed according to modern maxims; that they ought to abandon as much as possible their original character, which was presumed to be a narrow one. What has been attempted in this bill, successfully or unsuccessfully, has been to restore part of their original character which had been lost, to bring back the most ancient idea of the University, partly because this was also found to be the most comprehensive. This change in the direction of our thoughts and plans is owing, I conceive, very principally to the writings of an eminent Scotchman, Sir W. Hamilton. In his articles in the 'Edinburgh Review,' about twenty years ago, he

showed very clearly that the Universities, properly so called, had been merged in the Colleges,—that the reform which was most demanded was to restore them to life. He endeavoured to support this important doctrine by charges against the conduct of the Colleges, some of which, I think, were not supported by evidence, and have been disproved by subsequent investigations. He appeared to regard the whole scheme of Colleges with a suspicion and dislike in which I cannot participate. Respect for the name of Baliol, and for the benefits which have proceeded out of the society bearing that name from the fourteenth century to the present day, would alone prevent me from adopting that opinion. But this difference does not make me less sensible of the obligation under which Sir W. Hamilton has laid us all, by asserting the necessity of giving prominence and efficiency to the University, and not suffering the discipline of the Colleges, valuable as that may be, to overshadow it. It is this consideration which has led many, who have exceedingly disliked the thought of legislative interference with the bodies from which they have derived some of the greatest blessings of their lives, to acquiesce in the necessity of the present measure,—even to desire that a more comprehensive one had been adopted. They have no wish to see the Universities adapted to the tastes and notions of the public; they would have them correct and expand the public mind, not stoop to it. But they feel that their power for this purpose has been greatly cramped by the fact that the manly adult education which belongs to the University has been comparatively forgotten, and an education

which is not different in kind from the teaching of the grammar-school substituted for it. Thus the University loses the great influence which it ought to have upon the busy and professional life of the country, upon its physicians, its merchants, its lawyers, its statesmen. If our learned bodies will not reclaim this influence for themselves, the legislature must at all hazards remind them of their duty. The lion may not be the best companion for Una,—it would be far better that the Red Cross Knight should attend her on her journeys, and fight with her enemies; but if he is seduced from his proper function, a rough paw may be necessary to open doors that would otherwise be closed, that she may be able to sit and teach the savage tribes.

Here, then, is adult education asserting its rights, and proving its necessity, by the experience of our rich men and of our scholars, just as we found it doing in the schools of the poor by our inability to make the education of the young effectual without it. And the peculiar circumstances of this University Reform,—the undoubted evidence which has been produced that it is a re-form in the strict sense of the word, a restoration, not an innovation,—has forced the inquiry upon us, Whether adult education, in the history of Great Britain and of Europe generally, followed or preceded the education of the young? It is this question which I propose to examine to-day. Another, which is closely involved with this, and which is even more necessary for the object I have in view, Whether leisure or work is the proper and ordained ally of learning? I reserve for our next meeting.

Possibly some light might be thrown upon this subject if one knew more of those schools that were established by the Romans in the different provinces of their empire, a few notices of which may be found in M. Guizot's 'History of French Civilization.' But I do not think we should gain much from this information. Evidently those schools were labouring to keep up a kind of lore, which was nearly worn out and had become useless. The study of rhetoric, which was worth something while there was a Forum to practise it in, became utterly weak and inane when it was merely to be exhibited in school-exercises and declamations. How unsatisfying it was to any ardent and earnest spirit, we may learn from the account which St. Augustine gives of his own experiences of the African schools, comparing it with his intense interest and joy when he lighted, in his private reading, upon one of Cicero's philosophical treatises.

These schools gave way before those which were not merely Christianised, as some of them must have been in the later days of the empire, but which had a distinctly Christian foundation. We cannot separate these from the general history of the people among whom they were established. When—to take an instance which is familiar to us, and therefore the best we can find—the Christian Missionaries came to the Anglo-Saxons, they addressed themselves to the kings and queens, they appealed to the domestic affections and the national instincts which were always latent in the Saxons. To these all their doctrine and all their polity attached itself. Through these they led the

turbulent conquerors and lords of the sea and land, to feel that there was an invisible world about them which they could not conquer with their swords or traverse with their ploughs and ships; the world which had mixed so strangely in all their old songs and traditions with the visible and palpable one, which had before seemed a dark abyss, or a region in which giants were contending for the mastery, which was now announced to them as a quiet home and dwelling-place whither the spirits of men might fly from the noise and turmoil around them. The schools which rose up with such marvellous rapidity after the island had once been subdued by Christianity, were the results of this feeling and reflected it. They were places to which the poorest peasant might resort. But he went there on the condition of becoming a scholar. He was to devote himself to a new life. The invisible was to be his occupation; all his social economy had reference to that. It might be part of his business in the monastery to till the ground, to work with his hands—even an enjoined and necessary part of it. He might be doing much to improve agriculture and cultivate various arts, for which all men would afterwards be the better. But he was felt to have different objects from the kings and warriors, however they might confess his faith and receive his admonitions. They belonged to an outward circle, he to an inward one.

It would be the greatest mistake to suppose that this difference lay merely in the fact, that he was a student of theology, or that he practised certain religious exercises. These did not separate him so much from

the surrounding world—for they were acknowledged to be in some sense necessary for all men—as the fact that he was a student of arithmetic, of geometry, of music, of astronomy, of logic, and of rhetoric. The circle of studies which became the recognised one in our Saxon schools, had not originally been derived from an ecclesiastical source; we can trace it back very clearly to Boethius, that eminent statesman in the reign of Theodoric, who is often called the last of the classical Romans, and whose claims to the place which he has sometimes obtained among Catholic writers, are exceedingly doubtful. No doubt, parts of this course of teaching, the study of music especially, had a close affinity with the worship of the church, and was sustained by it. But the *scheme* of studies can only be looked upon as having been adopted by the ecclesiastics, not as having been suggested by them. The student life could never have established itself in a wild, warring people, except through their agency; the schools would not have been felt to have any meaning, if there had not been a divine atmosphere about them. But it was as schools that they stood in such sharp opposition to the ordinary occupations of men.

I should not have thought it necessary to make these remarks, which will seem to many very obvious, except for the purpose of calling your attention to the fact, that the education which was first established in our country, was not elementary education, but what we should consider now the reverse of it. Those subjects which we should call the professorial subjects, those which belong to science as such, were those from which all

other teaching took its commencement. This is true of every subject which I have mentioned. You may suppose, perhaps, that Arithmetic is an exception, that it appertains to an inferior class of subjects, adapted to the comprehension of the young. But if you adopt this notion, you are looking at arithmetic in another way than that in which these schools looked at it. Arithmetic is with them not identical with figures or counting; it is a branch of philosophy. If I were to read to you the introduction to the treatise of Boethius upon it, you would think that I was carrying you into the very depths of metaphysics. I am not going to impose any such penance upon you; but I wish you to perceive from what point it was that Britain, as well as every other country, started in its intellectual progress. We might have supposed that there would have been a gradual ascent towards this kind of erudition; but it is not the fact that there was. However unsatisfactorily they might resolve the problems of physics or dialectics, they entered upon them, even upon the most difficult of them, from the first.

You may ask, 'But what then did they teach their 'boys, and how did they teach them?' The question is a fair one, and we can give a tolerably satisfactory answer to it. There came a time of which we have some right to be proud, when a scholar of York was to help forward the instruction and civilization of the Continent. The story of the aid which Alcuin gave to Charlemagne in the education of himself and of the young princes, is familiar to many of you through M. Guizot's 'History of French Civilization,' and through Sir James

Stephen's 'Lectures on the History of France.' I do not think either of those eminent writers would allow us to claim for our countryman the whole, or the principal part, of the merit which belongs to the catechetical system of instruction, to which he subjected the monarch himself as well as the lads who were assigned him as his pupils. They would say that the exceeding activity of Charlemagne's own mind, his long training in affairs, his practical sense, obliged the tutor to adopt a more simple experimental method than he would have fallen into, if he had been lecturing in an academy. I quite accept this statement, and believe that this interesting chapter in the history of learning is one which brings out forcibly the truth, that a right education is the result of the collision and conflict between the practical intellect and the meditative intellect, that no true spark comes forth till the one is struck by the other. But though Alcuin may have found out something like the true method of teaching in this way, you must not suppose that his subjects were different from those of his contemporaries. He reasons with his boys about dialectics, and about the principles and grounds of philosophy; he talks with the conqueror of the Saxons, the wearer of the iron crown of Lombardy, about quantities and qualities, and contraries and opposites.

There is however a period far dearer than this to the hearts of Englishmen, far more closely connected with their moral and intellectual growth. It was ordained, mercifully ordained, that that Latin cultivation which the Christian monks had introduced, with all the

premature fruits which had grown out of it, should be swept away. The schools and monasteries, for the sake of which so many a mailed monarch had deserted his proper duties, and in which he had sought an ignoble rest and an ungodly repentance, were destroyed by the pirates of the North. Alfred, for his own good, and for the good of the land, was not suffered to know any Latin lore till he was twelve years old. He was brought up on the food which was fittest to make him a great Saxon king, the songs and ballads of his forefathers. So trained, his learning came to him when he wanted it; he understood what it was worth and why it was given him. For the first time one perceives a real Saxon education in the land, an education carried on not first of all by monks, though they might be instruments in communicating it, but by a king, trained in business and in adversity, who could appreciate books because he knew men, and who could tell what books men had need of. He had scholars about him, possibly one eminent and profound metaphysician; but his own sound practical sense kept them in order, and turned them to account, forcing them, whether they liked it or no, to use their wisdom for the culture of the nation. This example stands out clear and bright in our annals, a witness of much that was to be done hereafter, and of the way in which it was to be done. But Alfred's, like Alcuin's, was adult teaching.

Alfred's books were translations from the Latin. In the time which immediately followed his, the national spirit must have begun to utter itself in free and original songs, such as had not been produced for a

long time, perhaps not since the conquest of Britain. Then came the reaction. The Latin, or ecclesiastical learning, which had probably been too much kept down, asserted its supremacy under Dunstan, and tried to crush everything but itself. There must have been an uneasy conflict between the native wisdom and the foreign, between the warrior and the priest, till the beginning of the eleventh century. Then began, here and throughout Europe, the ascendancy of those mighty Normans whose old spirit had been so curiously preserved amidst their Gallic civilization, who were ready for the wildest enterprises, who were capable of the strictest organization, who had just enough of national feeling to make them the effectual agents in subduing all nations. These men were not only to establish kingdoms, vanquish infidels, frame doomsday-books; they were also to organize the monastic life, to establish the Latin and ecclesiastical culture, to reduce the schools as much as the world under discipline. In Eadmer's life of Anselm there are some curious and interesting stories respecting the education of children in the monastery of Bec, indicating the sensible notions of Anselm concerning the treatment of them. But the Norman discipline was essentially one for men, and not for children. Their whole school system was one which appealed to the faculties and thoughts of men, even while it stood furthest off from the ordinary business of their lives, even when it seemed to have least to do with their human feelings.

The twelfth century opens a new chapter in the history of education. The schools had hitherto been

inseparably connected with the monasteries. The organizing mind of the Norman had reduced all branches of thought and learning, even more completely than before, under the dominion of theology; and the learned life was regarded as part of the religious life. The great prominence which was given to the latter by St. Bernard, in the institutions which he founded and superintended, led to the undervaluing of the former. The venerable Peter of Clugny still asserted its rights in his society. But soon the separation makes itself manifest. Bodies came into existence for the pursuit of some special study or faculty, such as jurisprudence or theology, or for several united together. These bodies are first formed, perhaps, through the popularity of some particular lecturer; they soon acquire a corporate character; they are recognised as Universities, or corporations, for carrying on studies, as there were other corporations for carrying on trades. It may be supposed that now at length we have found places designed especially for the education of the young. Far from it. There were, as I have said, schools for boys in the monasteries, though the idea of the school was not deduced from them. University teaching is altogether removed from any such association. The lecturers address themselves expressly to that dialectical lore which we are wont to regard as entirely removed not only from boyish but from human sympathies.

There is apparently warrant for that impression; we might found upon it the conclusion that this teaching can only have attracted a few people of a peculiar cast of character. How marvellous, then, must it be to hear

what took place when the young Breton, Peter Abelard, was lecturing in Paris. Perhaps I might hope in the course of a few days to make every one here understand what the subject was on which he was disputing. 'I undertook,' he says, 'by most satisfactory argu-'ments to induce my old master, William, the arch-'deacon of Paris, to abandon that sentiment of his 'about Universals; for he would maintain that the same 'whole thing dwells essentially in each individual thing.' Well, to hear the unfortunate William of Paris confounded upon the doctrine which he had embraced on this subject, such crowds gathered together as no Parisian singer or actress ever yet succeeded in assembling. And when in a later period of Abelard's life, after he had experienced the tremendous temptations of popularity, as well as the dreariness and sinking of heart which come to a man who has no actual ties to his fellow-beings; after he had sought an escape from that dreariness by involving one much brighter and nobler than himself in a hopeless sorrow; when, after this, he returned to a certain cell for the purpose of lecturing upon theology, there rushed such a multitude of scholars to him, that, to use his own language, all the country round did not suffice to furnish them with dwellings, nor the soil with food. The whole story sounds like the most incredible romance; yet the evidence for it is clear and undoubted. Men and women in the twelfth century did not merely run to hear a powerful and popular preacher like St. Bernard; they not only could be dissolved in tears, when he spoke in a language which they did not understand; they

were also drawn by the strangest sympathy to the teachings of a subtle logician, and that not only in his earlier days, when he was young and handsome, and untainted in reputation, but after he had fallen into moral disgrace and was suspected of heresy.

The life of Abelard shows us, I think, that what we call the discussions of the schools, though they may be very unsatisfying to the deeper spirit of human beings, have yet something in them which may excite very strongly the intellects and even the passions of men, and that the mere business of the world does not furnish an adequate substitute for them. The next century records phenomena in the history of education which are scarcely less remarkable. It was the century in which the Mendicant Orders arose, the century in which Francis and Dominic appealed directly to the hearts of the most miserable people in Europe, presenting Christianity to them as especially meant for them. Now this peculiarly popular movement, which was so much mightier than all the policy of Innocent III. had been in breaking down the distinctions of nations, and in establishing the papal supremacy over them, was, in its issue, the great instrument of revolutionising the scholarship of Europe, which you might have fancied that its preachers would have disregarded. It was not only over the hearts of guilty or sorrowing men or women that these orders established their throne. Before they had existed half a century, they had fought for dominion in the universities, and had won it. They had succeeded in organizing the whole learning of these universities, in establishing what we emphatically call *the* scholastic

system, and in producing the most complete scheme of thought upon all possible subjects which the world ever has seen or ever will see. Those who believe that a complete system is *the* thing that man wants, should fall down and worship the books of Thomas Aquinas, for they will surely find nothing that is so worthy of their idolatry. If this is the climax of education, it reached its climax in the thirteenth century. But in that century men began to discover that they wanted something else than this—something entirely different from this. They did not wait to be told that secret by later times; it was found out then. Roger Bacon, the Franciscan, was unwinding in his laboratory a great part of that web which Thomas Aquinas, the Dominican, had been weaving in his study. He was showing that physical science, at all events, is occupied primarily with facts, not with the words that describe facts. He was conspiring with other teachers—some of them of his own order—to suggest the thought that moral science may be in the same predicament. And there was a vehement reaction against both the orders, arising from national feelings which were beginning to express themselves in a national language, that did more than all other influences together to prevent the schools from becoming omnipotent.

Thus far we have had only occasional glimpses of any distinct education for the boy. He has been bred in the monastery; the studies which belonged to his elders have in some way or other been communicated to him; but the schools have certainly not existed primarily for his sake: the name suggested to our

ancestors a thought most unlike that which it ordinarily suggests to us. In the period upon which we now enter, the school in our sense, the school as identified with the training of the young, comes into sight. I wish you to consider how our Grammar-schools grew up, how they acquired such dignity and importance in our social economy, in what relation they stand to the older education. But we cannot at once enter upon that subject. The Universities as such, the Universities as schools in quite a different sense from this, must still fix our attention for a few moments. They of course were the homes of the Latin lore, while that great English movement to which I was alluding was going on in the heart of the middle or trading class of the country. But though this is true on the whole, it would be a great mistake to suppose that the Universities were exempt from their share in that movement—nay, that they did not furnish some of the great leaders in it. There was an old scholastical quarrel with the friars, which was contemporary with the national quarrel, and which often mingled with it. The orders had intruded themselves into the schools. But that vulgar talent which enabled them to appeal to the worst feelings of the mob, was, especially when they became degenerate, and their higher principles had decayed, by far their most effective instrument. The earnest student would be disgusted by these exhibitions; he would often transfer his disgust from them to the elaborate subtleties which he found the friars inventing when they assumed their other character. Sprung himself from the people, he would appeal to the homely sense of

the English people, to their business-like habits, against the circulators of the popular legends. As a teacher in the schools, he would turn to the Bible as an escape from the intricacies of its commentators. The position of Wycliffe, first in Oxford, afterwards as a parish-priest in Lutterworth, explains the way in which these different tendencies worked together. His translation of the Bible, the only really important work in which he was engaged, embodies both, and shows us how impossible it was that the new English practical feeling could have grown up without the Latin culture, how certain it was they would stand out in fierce opposition to each other, how surely they would, some time or other, be forced to coalesce, how surely those who were most possessed by the one temper would often exhibit in themselves the influences of the other.

I have spoken of a strife between the Universities as such and the Orders as such. I conceive that there was a very strong feeling in the thirteenth century that the University, however the teachers in it might be members of orders, was to preserve itself distinct from the orders, to show that it had a function altogether different from theirs. But, if it was to maintain this position, the University must have a social life of its own. It could only resist the monasteries, if it could provide its scholar with an intercourse and fellowship which resembled that of the monasteries. To this impulse, as well as to a strong local feeling, a desire to connect the towns and counties which were dear to them with the learning which belonged to the whole land, may be traced the foundation of the Colleges which began to

grow up at this period in our Universities, and which are truly said to constitute the most purely English element in them. Three of those in the University of Oxford—University, Baliol, and Merton Colleges—belong to the thirteenth century. The name of the first, the wills and statutes of the founders of all three, show that they acknowledged the existence of an elder and larger society, of which they were to form a part, which they were never intended to swallow up in themselves, the characteristic studies of which their fellows were to pursue and to teach. There were also the signs of those other intentions to which I have alluded; but I do not perceive, thus far, that the training of the young is at all a principal object. The fellows of University College were to study divinity, or the decretals. The sixteen scholars whom the widow of John Baliol settled in a tenement in Oxford were to pray for the souls of her husband, or ancestors, or children. Of Walter de Merton's society the University Commissioners say expressly, that it was not bound by the monastic vows, that it belonged to none of the religious orders, that his object was to counteract the influence of the regular clergy, especially of the Mendicant Friars.

In the fourteenth century, the case is different. The University Commissioners say, evidently with the greatest truth, that the foundation of New College was a new era in Oxford history. In fact, if we wish to understand this important stage in our subject, we cannot do better than consider the character and objects of its eminent founder, William of Wykeham. There is some diffi-

culty, however, in arriving at a right judgment of him. The University Commissioners say, 'that he gave a more 'ecclesiastical, or rather monastic, character to his foun-'dation, than had belonged to any previous one. The 'very character of his buildings,' they add, 'secluded and 'gloomy outwardly, but stately and convenient within, 'intimate what was in his thoughts. The statutes, 'which are minute and elaborate to an extent before 'that time unprecedented, impressed a monastic cha-'racter on the whole institution.' This evidence is very strong. William of Wykeham, as he proved both at Windsor and Winchester, was a consummate architect; his buildings might seem to be the most faithful expressions of his inward feeling. He wrote his statutes three times: in them he embodied his maturest thoughts. If they suggest the same conclusion as the exterior of his College, it would seem to be irresistible. And yet if we turn to the life of him by Bishop Lowth, the most accomplished Wykehamist of the last century, who has given the most patient and conscientious attention to all the original documents respecting him, and has put them together in a skilful and scholar-like manner, we should conclude that the subject of his biography, instead of having the least of a monastical tendency, was the best man of business of his time, the most thoroughly conversant with all civil affairs. Lowth quotes from a warden of New College, who lived fifty years after the death of Wykeham, the opinion that he knew very little of speculative wisdom, that he was too poor to have attained any scholastical knowledge in his youth, but that in practical wisdom he was

unrivalled. Edward III. had clearly that opinion of him: he was his chancellor in the most difficult times; no public or private business seems to have come amiss to him.

I make these remarks—not only because it is always well to look at a remarkable man from two points of view, and to see how opposite notions respecting him may arise; but because it is on the reconciliation of these two characters that his place in a history of education depends. The impulse which proceeded from him caused the foundation of All Souls and Magdalen, as well as his own College; but this was the least part of his work. It is the union of Winchester College with New College, of the school for boys with the school for men, which is the great fact of his life. He evidently felt that the time was past when any good could come from the foundation of monasteries or abbeys; but that the principle which had been latent in them, and which was only producing idlers, might be turned to profit, provided the school and life could be connected, provided the stiff scholarship which belonged to the man could be bound up with the growth and expansion of the boy, through healthful exercises of the body as well as mind. If they could hold their due relation and proportion to each other—if one could be a nursery to the other—if the higher education could determine the character of the lower, and the lower send back energy and vitality to the higher—the University and the Grammar-school might furnish good and brave citizens to the commonwealth.

I shall not apologise for saying so much of William

of Wykeham, seeing that the principle which was expressed in his statutes was adopted by Henry VI. in the foundation of King's College and Eton, and that therefore it is a key to all the educational movements of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries in England. Those are the centuries in which the great movement which we usually describe as the revival of letters was going on upon the Continent. The civil wars hindered us from partaking in it as much as we otherwise might; but these are the witnesses of the effect which it was to produce upon us,—a practical and national effect, for the sake of which one can spare some of the more showy effects which it produced in other lands.

I will notice only one more indication of that period: it is one of the ironies of history, which I have no doubt has often been alluded to. Lincoln College was founded in 1427, for the purpose of training theologians to exterminate the principles of Wycliffe. Its founder was Richard Fleming, who had been a Wycliffite himself. Among the theologians whom his bounty raised up, to exterminate the notion that Christianity might be taken out of its scholastical forms and presented directly to the body of the people, was John Wesley. The wills of founders, it would appear, may sometimes be defeated without the interference of Commissioners and Cabinet Ministers.

Nor was that notion exterminated in the century which followed the death of Fleming, though in the beginning of the reign of Henry VIII. it seemed likely enough to suffer that fate. Henry himself was an enemy of it, in his double character of king and school-

man. Wolsey was the enemy of it, as the most magnificent of churchmen and statesmen, and as the patron of University learning. Sir Thomas More was the enemy of it, as lawyer, scholar, and divine. But the learning and piety of the friend of Erasmus were as little able to withstand the mighty and divine impulse of that time, as the splendour of the Cardinal and the will of the Tudor. The claim that each man should be recognised as a living personal being, was too strong for any school wisdom to struggle with. That wisdom must adjust itself, as it could, to the conviction which the hearts of numbers had received as a direct message from heaven. And it did strive, sometimes awkwardly, sometimes skilfully, to make the adjustment. In the sixteenth century, more than in the fourteenth, the leaders of the Reformation were to be found in the Universities, though there also were its greatest antagonists. The new learning was the instrument of the new faith. Language was the study to which those who would fight the schoolmen, and bring forth the Bible, must devote themselves. Philology became to the men of this time what Logic had been to their fathers. And philology could not be treated as logic had been, as a subject for University disputations. The grammar must actually be learnt; the sooner the learning could begin, the better. The boys' school had now an importance which it had not before; it was especially the place for learning the grammar; it was, therefore, the place for arming the Protestant warrior. That this feeling was strong in the reign of Edward VI., any one who looks into the statutes of the schools which were founded then under royal and

reforming patronage will perceive. And hence there was a kind of chasm between the studies of the school and those of the University which had not existed before. The prelections and disputations there seemed as if they had no bearing upon that which the boy was reading or committing to memory. Very soon the Jesuit reaction against the Reformation began. Among the three weapons in the armoury of this order, the school was more trusted and more successful than even the pulpit and the confessional. But the school meant among them what it was beginning to mean among their opponents, the place for training boys and girls, for bringing them up in the opinions which they were to hold in mature life. The business was to furnish manuals on all possible subjects. Education was becoming an art, which had its own doctors and professors. Our worthy Roger Ascham embodied his notion of the art in his 'Schoolmaster;' the rules of the Jesuits on the subject were, I doubt not, contained in much more elaborate and skilful treatises. Fortunately there was at our grammar-schools something better than any dogmas about the art of training; there was a free hearty life, games in which the limbs were expanded, a discipline which, with all its sternness, yet assumed boys to be human creatures, not machines. There was this good, which we must always thankfully acknowledge; there were defects and evils, of which England had to endure the penalty, and which drew forth the complaints and protests of some of the best and noblest of her sons.

It is startling to hear such words as these from Lord

Bacon. He is advising King James touching Mr. Sutton's estate, that is to say, touching the project of Christopher Sutton to found the Charter House School. He says,—'Concerning the advancement of learning, I 'do subscribe to the opinion of one of the wisest and 'greatest men in your kingdom, that for grammar-'schools there are already too many, and therefore no 'providence to add where there is excess: for the great 'number of schools which are in your highness's realm 'doth cause a want, and doth cause likewise an over-'flow; both of them inconvenient, and one of them 'dangerous. For by means thereof they find want, in 'the country towns, both of servants for husbandry and 'apprentices for trade; and on the other side, being 'more scholars bred than the state can prefer or em-'ploy, and the active part of that life not being in 'proportion to the preparative, it must needs fall out 'that many will be bred unfit for other vocations, and 'unprofitable for that in which they are brought up; 'which fills the realm full of indigent, idle, wanton 'people.'

But he says in the next paragraph, 'Therefore in 'this point I wish Mr. Sutton's intentions were exalted 'a degree; that that which he meant for teachers of 'children, your majesty should make for teachers of 'men; wherein it hath been my ancient opinion and 'observation, that in the Universities of this realm, 'which I take to be of the best endowed Universities of 'Europe, there is nothing more wanting towards the 'flourishing state of learning, than the honourable and 'plentiful salaries of readers in arts and professions.

'Surely readers in the chair are as parents in sciences, 'and deserve to enjoy a condition not inferior to the 'children who embrace the practical part; else no man 'will sit longer in the chair than till he can walk to a 'better preferment. . . . . For if the principal readers, 'through the meanness of their entertainment, be but 'men of superficial learning, and that they shall take 'their place but in passage, it will make the mass of 'sciences want the chief and solid dimension, which 'is depth, and to become but pretty and compendious 'habits of practice.'

These weighty sentences are the weightier because Bacon was the great protestant against the method of study which he had found established in the Universities: a great part of their dialectical system seeming to him a grievous and fatal check on the free investigation of nature. And I would remind you that his fear that the sciences should become merely 'pretty and compen-'dious habits of practice,' did not arise from any want of the practical element in himself. It was predominant in him; in it lay his strength and his danger. But he felt that there would be an end of all true and manly practice, if it were not continually fed from springs that are not in itself. He knew that it would become formal, traditional, improgressive, if it were not associated with fixed and eternal principles.

If I had time, I should endeavour to show you what illustration this remark receives from the treatise of Milton on Education, in his letter to Mr. Hartlib, which, whatever may be the merits or mistakes of the plan of study which it recommends, is one of the most sug-

gestive books ever written, as it is one of the bravest and noblest; a witness, as all his other books are, that no man had drunk more deeply into the spirit of our English institutions, if he was over impatient of the forms, when the spirit, as he thought, had departed from them. I should refer also to the treatise of Locke on Education, which I should like a foreigner to read immediately after he had read Milton's letter on the same subject, that he might understand what different aspects our literature presents. He will find two men writing at an interval of a few years, brought up, one may say, in the same dogmatical school, treating on the same topics, disliked by the same people, one of whom cannot prevent his thoughts and his words from rising into poetry if he is treating of the vulgarest topics, the other of whom must speak the plainest prose if he is occupied with the most sublime. Nevertheless, the foreigner will, I think, discover in both that honest benevolence which never scorns anything as beneath them in which human beings are interested. He who was busy with all the highest questions of faith and government, who was fresh from the air and associations of Italy, who was meditating the divinest poem, was at the same time the hard-working schoolmaster in Aldersgate Street; he who aspired to lay down the laws of the Understanding did not forget that he was bred a physician, and could define accurately the proper thickness of children's shoes.

But this practical English wisdom was beginning in the seventeenth century, more and more to stand aloof from that which was embodied in the Colleges and

Universities. The schools and the world were not, as they had once been, different spheres; they became competitive and hostile, each striving to do the work of the other. The schools seized the principles which the previous century had vindicated, and reduced them into hard systems, robbing them of their life; the world tried to fashion an education for itself, which should meet its emergencies, and create for it hands, not men. While this war was going on, while it was at its height, good men of the upper and middle classes became suddenly aware that a population was growing up around them, which was without knowledge, without the means of acquiring knowledge. We can never be thankful enough for the discovery, and for the earnest efforts which it awakened. To these probably we owe it, that Great Britain was able to preserve, and somewhat to improve, the education of her gentlemen; if they had not bethought them in time of rescuing the children of their labourers from barbarism, their own might have become barbarous. I am convinced that the experiments which have been made in the education of the boys and girls and infants of the lower classes have done us all more good than we can measure. Nevertheless it was inevitable that these experiments, undertaken at a time when there was much disorder and perplexity in the thoughts of our countrymen about the teaching which they had possessed for centuries, when there was so great a discord between thought and action, should have been hastily conceived and not very consistently worked out. 'Boys 'and girls must be taught, at all events, to read and 'write and cipher; what else they should be taught we

may consider afterwards;' this was the first and very natural thought of people living in an age of printed books, and wont to regard money transactions as the most important of all. But instructions starting from this ground, however reasonable a one it may seem, have not been found to accomplish the purpose at which they aimed, to say nothing of any higher purpose. It does not signify how many studies, sacred or secular, you append to these first and elementary studies; it does not signify on what plea you append them; education can never be felt to be the rightful portion and inheritance of Britons, its own meaning and dignity must be altogether forgotten, when you determine its purpose by that which is at best only its starting point. Learning cannot look Work in the face; it must quail at the sight of its steady progress, its mighty achievements. Your boys and girls must scorn their primers when they see what can be done, what they themselves can do, with the help of the steam engine. Unless you can find some way of showing them that Learning and Working presume each other are necessary to each other, you are but spinning a web to-day which to-morrow will unravel.

Now it has seemed to me that the circumstances of this time especially invite us and oblige us all, to consider how this reconciliation may be brought about. I do not mean merely the circumstances which discourage us respecting the issue of our past efforts for the poor; I mean those which begin to give us some hope of a reform in the institutions which accident, not their original intention, has nearly confined to the rich. The

discussions respecting the Universities show us how our education has taken its rise, what have been the great helps, what have been the most serious hindrances, to its advancement and its diffusion. If you seriously meditate on the facts which these discussions have brought to light, they may lead you to conclusions very different from those to which they lead me; but they will at least force you to admit that those who would try to encounter the great question, how grown men may be trained to think as well as to act, are not running counter to the wisdom of other ages, are not despising the lessons which the noble men who flourished in them, by their words and their deeds, have bequeathed to us.

I have been far too long, but I cannot conclude without one observation more. It was felt to be a very great step in Education, when the infants' school was added to the schools for boys and girls. There were some who hoped everything from that addition. 'When 'we have reached the cradle,' they said, 'we have found 'the standing point from which we can move the world.' You may fancy, perhaps, that I am entirely at issue with these sanguine dreamers; seeing that I have taken the ascending instead of the descending line; that I have attributed our failures not to our neglect of those who have not reached the age of boyhood, but of those who have passed it. But I can clear myself of this charge. Whatever the infant *school* may have done or may not have done, I believe that the zeal which has been awakened respecting infant education has been of unspeakable worth. I believe it for two reasons. First

because it has been impossible in educating little children to think chiefly of reading and writing and cipering. We have been compelled to remember that we have living spirits to deal with, which must by most wonderful and mysterious processes, wherein we may be agents, wherein we cannot be principals, be brought to trust, to think, to hope, to know. My second reason is, that those who think most earnestly of infant education must think of adult education. However they may reverence the descending scale, they cannot expect to teach infants by infants. They must above all things desire that the mothers should have wise, loyal, English hearts. By all means let us labour for that end. If I did not believe that the education of working men would lead us by the most direct road to the education of working women, I should care much less for it. But I am sure that the earnest thoughtful man who is also a labourer with his hands, instead of grudging his wife the best culture she can obtain, will demand that she should have it. He will long to have a true household, he will desire to bring up brave citizens. He will understand that his country looks to the wives and mothers, in every one of her classes, as the best security that the next generation of Englishmen shall not make her ashamed.

LECTURE II.

LEARNING AND LEISURE.

THE maxim, that all hope for the improvement of our country lies in the education of her youth, was examined in my last Lecture. I pointed out some of the difficulties which those experience who try to carry it into practice. The children of the poor, and of some who are not absolutely poor, are taken away for the business of the world, before they have acquired more than a smattering of knowledge from the school. That smattering of knowledge is not found to be of any great avail afterwards: the complaint has gone forth, that they have not cultivated the faculty or obtained the information which fit them to be serviceable citizens. Either they are awkward in the business to which they devote themselves, or in the pursuit of it they forget most of the little lore which they have brought with them. These statements may be much exaggerated; if they are true, there must be innumerable exceptions. But the evidence for them is too strong not to shake terribly the expectations which we had most of us built on our schools for boys and girls.

Is it possible, then, to found schools for men? If we cannot keep the young from business, may we teach the full-grown who are already busy? May we endeavour to give parents an interest in the education of their children by educating *them?* At first sight the difficulties in the way of such a project seem far greater than those which we are encountering now—the materials which we have to mould are so much harder and less pliable. But it is not always safe to act upon first impressions. What is the testimony of history on the subject? I endeavoured to trace the intellectual growth of Europe, but especially of England, through a series of ages, dwelling not upon events that happened in a corner, or that looked important to an individual or a party, but on those which were admitted by all to be of deep and wide significance. The inference appeared irresistible. Schools, according to the original force of the word, had not a direct application to children. They were places for preserving and expanding the studies which belong especially to men. They were intended to make men conscious that they had other organs besides the organs of sense, and that these had their proper objects and exercises. The result was the same, whether we looked at the schools which grew up in England after its conversion to Christianity, or to the lessons which Alcuin imparted to the Frankish monarch, or to the Saxon discipline of Alfred, or to the systematic Latin culture in the Norman monasteries, or to the Universities in the twelfth century, or to those Universities in the thirteenth century, when they had in a great measure submitted to the mendicant

orders, or again in the fourteenth, when Colleges were growing up in them which were substitutes for the cloister life, and were directing it to another purpose. Adult education was always taking precedence of juvenile education, determining its objects and for the most part its form, exercising an influence over the whole of society which that could never have exercised. In due time we saw the Grammar-school arising; but it arose in connexion with the College, the College itself being under the shadow of the University. Gradually these schools for boys obtained an independent importance; their connexion with the adult teaching was not as obvious as it had been. Then Bacon wished to check the growth of them, to direct the bounty of kings and subjects again into the channel of the Universities: then Milton complained that both had lost their manly character, and had ceased to serve the commonwealth. In modern times we found that the English University had gradually assumed the form of an advanced Grammar-school. Hence the complaints of its inefficiency; hence the demand for reformation; hence the readiness with which those who are least disposed that the Universities should take the shape which the public would give them, have consented that their restoration should be promoted by the legislature.

A conclusion honestly deduced from facts so various and so inconsistent as these, has some right to be considered of weight. Yet I can conceive that it may still appear to many quite incredible. It would appear so to me—scarcely any amount of historical evidence would

induce me to accept it—if I felt that it really contradicted the principle which the champions of early education are asserting. They are certain that a full-grown man who has been without education all his life, must be in a more hopeless condition for receiving it than a child or a boy. There can, I conceive, be no doubt of that proposition. The question is, whether this is the condition in which our forefathers found those to whom they imparted their lessons; whether this is the condition in which we shall find the working-men of our day. The people of Kent and Northumbria might perhaps have seen no Christian Missionaries till Augustine or Paulinus came among them. But surely it would be a prodigious mistake to say that they had had no teaching which prepared them for that of the Missionaries, none but what interfered with it. They had the sun and moon and stars over their heads; they had the earth which they were trying to cultivate; they had the ocean on which they were sailing. They had children, brothers, wives, husbands. They had affections and sorrows; they had life and death. These were schoolmasters that had been at work upon them, and without whose aid Augustine and Paulinus, I apprehend, would not have done much. They might meet with some who had studied well, some who had studied ill, under these doctors; some whose old traditions had overshadowed or effaced their lessons; some in whom those same traditions had awakened thoughts which they would not otherwise have had. They may have met with some comparatively at ease, some dissatisfied and restless; but they will not have met with a single man

who had not been under a training, a very wonderful training, carried on, as they held, if they had faith in their own proclamation, by an invisible Being of whom they could give clearer and more authentic tidings than the Saxons had yet received.

In like manner, we are not exactly to conclude that Charlemagne had no preparation for that strange lore about contraries and opposites, which Alcuin brought to him. He might have been occupied chiefly in fighting and ruling; but he could not carry on either of these operations without speaking. If he spoke, his words followed one another in some order; his discourses obeyed some laws as well as his armies. Those laws were the laws of grammar and of logic. He had been a grammarian and a logician all his life without knowing it. Alcuin only made him aware of the fact, which caused him, no doubt, a new and a very delightful surprise, and which he took in with ten times more intelligence and relish because he was in the habit of observing facts.

The simple teaching of Alfred in geography and history was addressed to people living in an island, and often seeing ships which came to them from other countries with strange things and stranger men; to people who had come to know that they were members of a nation, and therefore cared to know what the nation had been doing before they were born. If you wonder that in the centuries which followed, this kind of teaching seemed to be less prized than that which had no native associations, that which, as we are wont to say, consisted only in verbal subtleties, I must ask

you again to remember that words have as much to do with human beings as swords and ingots have; that words were the special weapons of the scholar as distinguished from the warrior and the merchant, though all three were obliged to use them; that to enter into the force and conditions of these words and the relations in which they stood to things, did not look like trifling, but like a very solemn and serious occupation indeed. Those crowds who rushed to hear Abelard talk about universals and particulars, were thoroughly awake and in earnest. They supposed that he had something to tell them which concerned them as thinking beings; and what had to do with them in that character struck them as of not less importance than what had to do with them as eating and drinking beings.

There was, then, a previous education and discipline which led men in these ages to seek for certain kinds of intellectual food. They received the food if it met the particular hunger which had been awakened in them; if any other had been provided, it would have been rejected. Are we to suppose that it is altogether otherwise in our day? Have our working people received no education for which they are not indebted to us? They have, at all events, some of those books out of which their forefathers read. They see the sun and stars occasionally, even in London and Manchester; often enough to remove any scepticism as to their continued existence. They have brothers, wives, sons; they have to fight with sorrows, inward and outward —with life and death. They converse with each other in words, as men did in other days, as men do still in

other classes. Their words follow certain laws, understood or misunderstood. They belong to a nation richer by a thousand years in history than it was when Alfred reigned. The government under which they live affects them for good or evil as his did the inhabitants of Wessex, and the more distant provinces out of which our England was only beginning to form itself. I speak of that which they have in common with those who discovered that the lore of the schools concerned them. We are wont to boast that our century has immeasurable advantages which theirs could not dream of. We talk of our cheap books, magazines, newspapers. We delight to remember that our people throw shuttles, work engines, transmit lightning messages. Can it be that they crave less for intellectual nourishment than those did upon whom we look almost with contempt, or that they have not the same organs for masticating and digesting it?

There is one answere ommonly given to this question which sounds most plausible and decisive. 'The 'circumstances of our working people,' it is said, 'are altogether unlike the circumstances of those with 'whom you compare them. The name we give them 'points out what the difference is. The schools, you 'admit, though they were open to the poor, were separate 'from the ordinary interests and pursuits of men whether 'rich or poor. Our people are absorbed in these interests 'and pursuits. The successful worker cannot be at the 'same time the student. Scraps of loosé miscellaneous 'lore he may pick up from time to time. When his daily 'tasks are over, he may be persuaded sometimes to

'sleep on the bench of a lecture-room rather than on 'the bench of a beer-house. There will, of course, be 'exceptions, but, as a rule, leisure and learning have 'always gone and will always go together. Your busy 'man of the upper and middle class, even though his 'occupations may be scientific or literary, or benevolent 'or religious—even though he can intermit them when 'he likes—is not a thinker. He knows about a num-'ber of topics, but he does not deepen or improve our 'wisdom or his own. Can you expect a better result 'from men whose toils are not voluntary, but com-'pulsory, and, to a great extent, of a dull mechanical 'kind? Industry is good, science and literature are 'good; but they have always kept at a respectful dis-'tance from each other; nor is that distance likely to 'be diminished as the demands for the fruits of industry, 'and therefore upon the time of those who produce 'them, become more imperative.'

Upon this showing, the chief warrant for our pride and self-congratulation is the reason why we must always despair. Because our works are so much greater than those of our forefathers, we must be content that our men should be less intelligent, less human, than they were; we must expect that the more they achieve, the more ignorant they shall become, the more every higher faculty in them shall be dwarfed. This decree, if it is announced with ever so much confidence, if it looks ever so indisputable, is somewhat too mournful to be immediately acquiesced in. We must at least consider whether the statements on which it rests are quite invulnerable.

One peculiarity in the history of our time is curious, and deserves a little to be reflected on. The most intelligent patrons of juvenile education,—those who have had most opportunity of seeing how it works, and what are its defects,—are very generally convinced that all our schools ought to be industrial schools. Great as are those diversities of opinion to which I alluded in my last Lecture, there is a startling agreement on this point among those whose judgment is entitled to any respect. I have heard that some who have spent their lives in promoting the instruction of the poor, and whose purses are as open as ever they were, have declared that they will not give a shilling to any school in which work and teaching are not combined. Now, though I am sure that one of their objects is to prepare the children for being tailors or shoemakers or cooks or housemaids hereafter, I cannot believe that this is their chief object. Sullen masters and mistresses may say that they do not care for the school apprenticeship, that they could teach their servants better themselves. But the advantages of this discipline are found to be immediate, not prospective. The children may not at once earn better wages in consequence of the facility they have acquired, but they do their school tasks infinitely better. Not only are their bodily powers cultivated, but the words which they read acquire a life and reality which they scarcely ever have when the book stands by itself, when the only business is to spell it out. On the other hand, the work, even if it is imperfectly executed, is understood to be a part of the day's duties; its character is raised; and the child does not look forward to the workshop as

something which is to separate him from all that he is doing before he goes to it.

These are very substantial arguments on behalf of a course which is adopted by persons, to whose authority and experience we might bow if they had no arguments to bring forward at all. They may go very little way towards shaking the doctrine about the connexion of Learning and Leisure, in any mind in which it has taken root; but those who believe that the child is the father of the man, and who cannot perceive that the school industry can be different in kind from the industry of the world, or that the last must not serve the same end as the first in a higher degree, because it is more real, may at least be ready to wait for further evidence before they pronounce that work when it is most effective, most productive, must of necessity be incompatible with regular and manly study.

Some further evidence on this point, I believe, we derive from the experience of other classes. The old adage about the dulness which comes to the schoolboy when he has all work and no play, might be considerably changed without losing its force. Cricket and rowing, when they are pursued earnestly,—and every true boy must be earnest in all he does,—become very hard work indeed. They are wanted as work, and as work they make the proper school tasks immeasurably more profitable than they would otherwise be. The grammar-school becomes in that sense an industrial school. The games are happily voluntary, not formal and prescribed. But there is an order and discipline in them, as in those pursuits of which the master takes cognisance; if they

were to cease, he would feel the difference as much as his pupils.

At the University the case is still stronger. There the craving for action becomes exceedingly vehement. In some it is satisfied by bodily exercises; those of the grammar-school giving place to others belonging to a more advanced age, the cricket-bat being deserted for the scarlet coat. But those who never have these impulses, or cannot gratify them if they have, exhibit the same eagerness to be about the tasks of the world,—to be doing, and not merely reading. I suppose most persons, in looking back to the time they passed at College, know what this feeling is, and to what morbidness and restlessness it gave rise. Though they might not expect to draw any considerable prizes in the lottery of the world, they still wished to be in the midst of it, and, if that was not possible, to obtain what semblance of it they could get in rooms and walks which seem to derive their beauty from the exclusion of it. Of course, it is easy to account for all such tempers of mind by repeating commonplaces about the discontent of every one with his own lot, about the longing of the landsman for the sea and the sailor for land, and so forth. If you delight in retailing such wise saws, which have done duty in boys' themes for about two thousand years, you can find an additional instance to support them in your own later experiences,—in the pleasure with which, being amidst the smoke and noise of cities, you reflect upon the quiet of the cloister, and desire a home in it. Each fact is well worthy of being noted and reflected on; each confirms and explains the other.

But they ought not to suggest so barren a moral, as that no one can be happy where he is; they should lead us to ask ourselves very seriously, whether the life of thought and the life of action have not a necessary relation to each other, according to the laws of God's providence, according to the constitution of man; and whether there can be contentment—whether there ought to be—when they are divorced from each other.

I have spoken first, as I did in the former Lecture, of our present experience, because I have no notion that any one will attend to the lessons of the past unless he can connect them with that and use them for the illustration of it. But let us next consider, what the moral and intellectual history of nations and individuals says in favour of that pretty alliteration of Learning and Leisure; whether they have really any thing more to do with one another than Macedon and Monmouth; whether, on the other hand, Learning and Working have not been shown in all ages, even when they have been most unnaturally severed, to be bone of each other's bone, flesh of each other's flesh.

No one has ever doubted that the monastic life and discipline are closely connected with European civilization. If any Protestant is afraid to confess this fact, he must be an exceedingly bad Protestant; one who acts upon the maxim which in words he repudiates, that truth may be concealed, and that we may lie for God; one who is ignorant to what men we owe the first impulses towards reformation. It is, in fact, the denial of the worth of the monastic life which has led to a monstrous exaggeration of its worth, to the fancy

which many in our day are cherishing, that it has a merit in itself, that it is less liable to abuse than other kinds of life, that it is desirable for all countries and all times; notions which the testimonies of monks and the histories of orders would much more completely refute than any criticisms or commentaries of ours upon them. The history of this life in the west,—for the monastic life of the east has quite a different meaning and character,—begins with the foundation of the monastery near Monte Casino in the middle of the sixth century. Thither came young Benedict in the year 528. There he established his order, there he proclaimed the rule which became the model for all subsequent rules, the standard which the restorers of discipline, after it had decayed, were always seeking to brink back. The Benedictines of the congregation of St. Maur, who in the seventeenth century were the most learned men in Europe, always maintained, that in devoting themselves to study they were following out the intentions of their founder. Benedict, by the acknowledgment of Gregory the Great, his biographer, was devoted to letters before he left Rome, and he certainly did immeasurably more to promote letters by going to Monte Casino, than he could have done if he had acquired and circulated all the knowledge which was then to be found in the capital. What he did was to lead men away from their farms and their merchandise, that they might become the teachers of the nations, the asserters of a spiritual and divine foundation for the culture of western Europe. Now the following passage is taken from the Benedictine rule; it embodies a maxim,

which you will perceive could not be merely a maxim, but was worked into the system. 'Idleness is the 'enemy of the soul. Therefore, at certain times the 'brethren must be occupied in the labour of the hands, 'and again at certain hours in divine study. We 'think that both ends may be accomplished by this 'arrangement. From Easter till the Calends of October, 'let them go out in the morning, and from the first hour 'till nearly the fourth let them labour for the procuring 'of that which is necessary. Again, from the fourth 'hour to about the sixth let them be at leisure for 'reading. Rising from the table after the sixth hour, 'let them have an interval of rest upon their beds, or if 'any one should wish to read, let him so read that he 'may not disturb his neighbour. At the ninth hour let 'them again work till the evening if the necessity of 'the place or their poverty require it, and let them 'gather the fruits of the earth, seeing that those are 'true monks who live by the labour of their hands, as 'our fathers and the Apostles did. But let all things 'be done moderately and in measure on account of those 'that are feeble. From the Calends of October till the 'beginning of Lent, let them be at leisure for reading 'till the second hour, then from the third to the ninth 'hour let all labour at the work which is enjoined 'them. In the days of Lent, let them be at leisure for 'their readings from the early morning to the third 'hour, from thence to the eleventh let them do the work 'which is enjoined them.'

I quote this passage that you may see what principles were recognised as fundamental in this discipline.

Working and learning so far, not learning and leisure, went hand in hand. Or rather, for this is the phrase which the Benedictine rule adopts, the reading was the leisure. The work of the hands demanded this to quicken and sustain it. The reading demanded equally the work of the hands as the condition of its being healthy and nutritive to the mind. Here in England, the Benedictine rule must have established itself very early; some modification of it existed probably from the time of Augustine. Whenever the monasteries sought to renovate themselves, or to recover their influence, they had recourse to it; it became strong under Dunstan, universal under the Normans. But there was, as I observed in my last Lecture, a conflict of the popular spirit with the monastical; they had alternate triumphs and defeats. Either I think would have destroyed the nation without the other; together they upheld it. The monastery became strong through the union of labour and study; then it waxed tyrannical and dangerous; soon it sunk into sloth and contempt. The kings and people became strong through the union of book wisdom with the common homely wisdom; then the mere traffic or amusement of the world was exalted above everything high and mysterious; feebleness and sensuality succeeded. Neither power was suffered to become utterly dead; the other rose up to struggle with it and to awaken its energies. The witness of each in itself and of both together is the same. Let learning try to exist by itself and it dies; let common industry try to exist by itself and it dies. The ease to which each gives birth murders its parent.

You hear much of the quibbles of the schools in the middle ages. I have ventured to question the justice of the word when it is used generally to describe the learning of those ages. The questions which turn upon the meaning of words are not quibbles; they may lead us into the deepest knowledge of ourselves; they may clear our minds of the quibbles and contradictions into which they fall through ignorance. But I do not in the least deny that the most miserable quibbles grew out of the logical controversies of that period. The eminent men of the day were almost as much aware of it as we can be. John of Salisbury in the reign of Henry II. formally denounced and exposed the trifles and triflers that encountered him in the schools as well as in the court. Whence came the trifling of the schools? The answer has been given again and again by those who have understood the subject best. They have said, 'The schoolmen had too much leisure. They 'had time to spin endless cobwebs. They were not in 'commerce with the business of the world. They 'could not test by it the worth of the thoughts with 'which their brains were teeming. They could not turn 'their thoughts into acts, and contemplate them apart 'from themselves. They were always working in sub-'terranean chambers, where they forged armour not for 'heroes to wear in their battles on earth, but to play 'with and fight with by the light of their own fires.'

I said that John of Salisbury alluded to the court-triflers as well as to the school-triflers of his day. They were men of the most opposite disposition, with an unbounded contempt for each other. Our Plantagenet

princes introduced into England the light literature of the south of France—the songs of the Troubadour minstrels. Jests and buffooneries came in with ditties and love-plaints. The monarch who received Ireland from Adrian IV., the monarch who led the armies of the Crusaders, delighted to hear the priests, and their faith, and their morals, turned into ridicule by these professors of another kind of lore. I am far from denying that they may have helped to rebuke hypocrisy, to check the predominance of the Latin schools, to show that there were aspects of life of which the ecclesiastics were not taking account. But it must also be understood that they scorned the people at least as much as the priests, that in our country their minstrelsy would have crushed the English tongue as much as the Latin. It should also be remembered, that everything which their enemies said of the grossness and depravity of their lives, and of the effect of their literature upon the South of France, is confirmed by the latest and the most impartial historical inquiries. There are no words strong enough to denounce the wickedness of those who sent a Crusade against that region, or to describe the demoniacal acts by which the soldiers of De Montfort sought to buy for themselves a place in heaven. Nevertheless, intelligent Protestants have maintained that the utter demoralisation which the Provençal literature expressed and promoted, made even that horrible visitation inevitable. The leisure and refinement of these doctors, their scorn of work, did not help much in the cultivation of Europe.

Thank God, its poetry and its art had a different

origin from this. It was not in the Court of Love that Dante found the person who purified and exalted his whole life; nor was his life the life of leisure which the worshippers in that court coveted and claimed for the minstrel. Trained to the hard work of the camp, bred in the severest discipline of the schools, immersed in the factions of Florence, occupied with the politics of Europe, compelled often to change his friends and to find that those from whom he had hoped most for his country were its deceivers and betrayers, he of all men could declare that he was not rocked and dandled into a patriot, a theologian, or a poet. And I apprehend we owe all the benefits which he has conferred on the world to this fact. He was not busy with abstractions, but realities. Eternal principles revealed themselves through events in which he suffered; through men whom he abhorred or loved. He discovered how much grandeur and permanence there is in that which outwardly is paltry and transitory. So the fierceness of party and of his own spirit drove him to seek for an order which will maintain itself in defiance of all factions and emperors and popes; which will avenge itself upon all. So the formulas of the schools became witnesses to him of that which is and which abides; so the bright vision which had cheered and sustained him in the sorrows of earth, brightened more and more into the serene and perfect day.

Possibly it will be admitted that the Poetry of Europe could not have grown up without this union of action and suffering with thought and study. But Painting, it will be said, is born and cradled amidst

softer airs and more genial influences; that at least requires patronage and leisure to foster it. Let us hear what testimony there is on this subject. I need not refer to any other authority, since I cannot refer to a higher, than Mrs. Jameson's 'Memoirs of the Early Italian Painters.' After pointing out the mistake into which many historians have fallen in placing Cimabue at the head of the great revolution in art in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, Mrs. Jameson says that the great merit of that artist was in perceiving and protecting the talent of Giotto, 'than whom no single 'human being of whom we read has exercised in any 'particular department of science or art a more immediate, wide, and lasting influence.' And then she tells a story which has often been told before, but never in clearer or more agreeable language than this:—'About the year 1289, when Cimabue was already 'old and at the height of his fame, as he was riding in 'the valley of Perpignano, about fourteen miles from 'Florence, his attention was attracted by a boy who 'was herding sheep, and who, while his flocks were 'feeding around, seemed intently drawing on a smooth 'fragment of slate, with a bit of pointed stone, the 'figure of one of his sheep, as it was quietly grazing 'before him. Cimabue rode up to him, and looking 'with astonishment at the performance of the untutored 'boy, asked him if he would go with him and learn. 'To which the boy replied that he was right willing if 'his father were content. The father, a herdsman of 'the valley, by name Bondone, being consulted, gladly 'consented to the wish of the noble stranger, and

'Giotto henceforth became the inmate and pupil of 'Cimabue.'

This story, resting on evidence which satisfies the accomplished narrator of it, goes much further, when it is connected with her remarks, than merely to prove, what no one perhaps would have doubted, that a shepherd boy may become a great artist. It shows that the refinement and cultivation of a man like Cimabue, sprung from the upper classes of society, commanding all the appliances for his art which were within any man's reach in his time, and possessing himself the divine gift which could turn them to account, was not able to produce any deep and lasting impression upon the arts in Italy till he had evoked the genius of this herdsman's son. I do not wish to push the inference to any unfair length. I only desire that it should be noted as a fact that thus the great art-movement in Europe began.

I have been the more anxious to speak of these Florentines, because it is to Florence that the supporters of the doctrine, that leisure is the necessary and natural support of learning, commonly turn with the greatest confidence and satisfaction. Passing lightly and not with much complacency over these rough and toilsome workers at the beginning of the fourteenth century—dwelling respectfully but in rather vague language upon the great inventions of the period which followed, talking magnificently of printing, but very little of the hard hands which wrought the first types, of the lonely and painful efforts of those who conceived and sought to realize the possibility of making them the expressions

of thought—alluding with somewhat more distinctness to the merchants who brought the treasures of Greece into the West—they transport us rapidly to the gardens of Lorenzo the Magnificent; they tell us to contemplate the scholars and sculptors and painters who are gathered there; and they bid us reflect devoutly on the way in which wealth and luxury have been able to change the face of the world, and to substitute refinement for barbarism. If these raptures were merely called forth by the spectacle of riches employed upon humanising instead of upon unworthy objects, one would be unwilling that they should be suppressed. Nor do I acknowledge any sympathy with the reactionary school which denounces Pagan literature and Pagan art as corrupting and mischievous. That school, I think, shows great ingratitude to God for some of the blessings He has bestowed on the earliest and the latest ages; benefits which may be instruments in delivering us from idolatry instead of leading us into it, as some of them did serve to break in pieces the idols which the middle ages had set up. But I must say, at the same time, that this school has found a great moral justification in the tone which has been taken by those against whom it protests. The outrages of Lorenzo and of his family upon liberty, have been excused and tolerated in compliment to their liberality. The brave witness which the Dominican Savonarola bore, that the new art could not reform nations plunged and steeped in iniquity, and that the fosterers of that art in high places were themselves the guiltiest of all, has been denounced as fanatical. Leo X. has been glorified as

the builder of St. Peter's and the patron of those who adorned it; and the questions, how he built it and paid for it, and what he was, have been treated as interesting to theologians, but as of little significance for those who are studying the progress of civilization and refinement. Is it wonderful that men of earnest minds should have risen up in their wrath, and have sworn that with such maxims and such doctrines they would have nothing to do; that they spring not from the reverence for art but from the reverence for wealth; that they lead not to the refinement of nations in the north or in the south, but to the enfeebling of all their moral, and therefore of all their intellectual, energies? Are they to be greatly blamed if they say that, if they must choose, they would rather have fought by the side of Ziska and his Bohemian savages, though they would have crushed all learning;—because they were struggling for a principle, because they were maintaining a privilege for mankind, —than have stood by the side of Leo, or even by the side of Erasmus, in support of a scholarship which was to be upheld by corruption and insincerity?

What I am most anxious to assert is, that, by these means and under these protectors, neither learning nor faith could have been maintained, and that the great Reformation movement was as necessary to the one as to the other. It was necessary, because it connected both faith and learning with the ordinary work of man; because it would not allow either to be shut up in monasteries or universities. Great as the crimes were which attended the destruction of the monasteries in our own land, bad as some of the consequences of that

act have been, I am glad to have the high authority of Mr. Hallam for thinking that its mischief to literature has been exceedingly overrated. The blessings which I spoke of as proceeding from the monasteries at their foundation, were precisely those which they were not conferring, and which they could not confer in this stage of their growth, or rather of their decrepitude. The crimes of their inmates might be far less than they were represented to be, their revenues might fall into hands which had no right to them, and which applied them ill; but the time, I conceive, was gone by, when they could meet the wants of the English character, and help to promote the intellectual and spiritual growth of its people. They could support beggars; they could not teach men to work, or teach them when they were working. The tradesmen of the towns had grown up under a discipline different from theirs, had fallen under teachers who were generally in opposition to them. That great undefined body which we now call the working classes had not yet taken shape at all. What its demands would be, could not be foretold. It might be guessed that the universities and grammar-schools, as they existed, would not suffice for those who were tied to manual occupations. But the amazing developments of our manufacturing and commercial industry lay hid in the unknown future. Our ancestors in the sixteenth century were removing various obstacles which checked them; it was not to be expected that they should provide for what might come even of the discoveries and inventions with which they were already acquainted.

But though the bodies which had promoted Learning

in former days might fail to promote it in this day, it was still a question whether it might not grow up under individual or state patronage; whether the same influences which were said to have called forth genius in Italy, which in the judgment of some even created it, might not work with the like effect in our colder climate. How far do the biographies of our most eminent men, illustrated by the history of their times, fulfil this expectation?

The age of Elizabeth is the glorious age of our literature only because it is the great working age of the nation; one in which all thought was connected with actual business, and was used for the interpretation of it. In action our writers on Government and Polity were formed. You would expect to find Hooker, perhaps, cultivating his faculties and acquiring his calm wisdom in some monastical retreat. You find him rocking his child's cradle, shearing sheep, listening to the objurgations of a very troublesome helpmate. Our noble Spenser will at least dwell chiefly in a fantastic world. On the contrary, his fairy-land is his common native earth. He could not distinguish Elizabeth from Gloriana. His supposed allegory mixes with all daily common transactions. It was in that battle for life and death in which every one of us is engaged, that his Sir Guyons and Artegalls and Britomarts and Arthurs proved their swords and won their laurels.

A few years ago it might have been thought that Shakspeare ought to have no place in a Lecture on Learning. We should have been told that he was the great type instance of the force of original genius

without learning. I do not anticipate any such objection now. I think all are agreed that historical learning, biographical learning, humane learning in the largest sense of the word, belonged to him, and that it did not drop upon him from the clouds; that he acquired it; that his genius enabled him to win it and to use it, but was not in the least a substitute for it. Most assuredly he did not obtain it in leisure, or in any school which exempted him from intercourse with the coarsest persons and occupations. If he had merely read the old chronicles of England he might have commented on them, much as others have commented on him. But he used them to interpret the actual world in which he lived, and so both pages became illuminated. There did not rise up in his study a frightful abstraction, called Man because it was unlike any individual creature that has ever borne the name. There did not arise from his empirical observations a set of walking figures labelled French, Italian, Dane, King, Poet, Doctor, noted by certain costumes and habits of speech, having nothing in common with each other. He found in the chronicles and tales which he read, men of all degrees, ages, and countries, who, because he took them to be essentially of the same flesh and blood and to have the same life with those whom he met in streets and taverns, presented themselves to him, and through him in a degree to us, with an awful distinctness; so that we know they *were*, and cannot but feel also that they *are*. And so, with next to no antiquarian or geographical lore, he could yet make our own history intelligible, and make us feel the distinction of climates and races, as no one else has

done. We ought not to admit for an instant that his circumstances were unfavourable to this cultivation; that it was marvellous he could be what he was, belonging, as he did, to the people. His circumstances were assuredly the best possible for him, as those we are born to are the best for us. It is clear, from the example of his contemporaries, who had some of the advantages which he had not, that if he had mixed in more artificial society he would have been less refined in his discourse, and, above all, less graceful and reverential in his appreciation of the female character, than he was. And, therefore, instead of setting him up as a mere marvellous phenomenon and an excuse for our self-worship, it might surely be better to ask whether he does not give us the hint of a cultivation at once popular and profound, humane and national, which might be available for thousands, who are not separated from their fellows by any accidents of class or condition.

No one, I think, quite likes to speak of Shakspeare as belonging to the reign of James I., though in that reign his greatest plays were produced, if not written. But there is another name which we feel belongs strictly to this time. Though the dedications which Lord Bacon has prefixed to his different works are not exactly the documents by which one most wishes to remember him, they thrust themselves in our way, to tell us that his conception of a Solomon was somewhat different from ours. Here then we may expect to find the proof that patronage and leisure were the great supports of learning, physical as well as humane. But the evidence fails just when it promises to be most

decisive. Of all men who have contributed to the advancement of knowledge, he was certainly the busiest. The pursuit of a scientific method never for a moment interrupted his occupations as a lawyer and as a statesman. Nor can it be said that science in his hands was at all indebted to patronage. He was always considering how it might be the better for that aid; but his own position was that of a reformer, of one who was dissatisfied with the condition of studies as he found it, and with the means which were taken to foster them. His own honours and dignities, as they were his chief calamities, so they contributed nothing to the benefit of the studies in which he delighted, except as they connected him with common life, and thus led him to be an experimentalist instead of a theorist.

I alluded in my last Lecture to the kind of leisure which Milton made for himself, after his return from Italy, when he became the teacher of boys in London. But there is an earlier stage in his life, between his leaving college and his going to Italy, when he may be thought to have cultivated leisure, the years during which he wrote Comus and Lycidas. I would advert for a moment to that time. No one can doubt that Charles I. afforded a much more graceful patronage to literature and to art than his father had done; not being himself the competitor of learned men, and caring more for the refined than for the scholastic parts of learning. The masques, which had been such fashionable entertainments in the former reign, probably acquired additional grace and dignity from the encouragement of Henrietta. I allude to that particular branch of art and literature,

for both art and literature were combined in it, (Inigo Jones had contributed his aid to it as well as Ben Jonson,) because it enables me to show you what Milton, the young Puritan, could effect in the very line that seemed especially appropriated to the court poets. They had gone on repeating, with more or less skill and talent, the same fantastical combinations of classical and fairy mythology, trusting really much more to the decorations, or to the ladies, who appeared as goddesses of the seas or the woods, than to the poetry which illustrated their looks. In his noble and gorgeous masque he discovers a purpose and order in that which had been merely grotesque. That which at best had merely reflected the tone of the court, had been sensual or correct according to its tendencies, is at once translated into a picture of the struggle of life, of the war which the spirit, seeking truth and purity, has to engage in with Comus and his midnight crew, of the divine powers which are at hand to break the spells of the enchanter, of the home which there is for those who seek it in the midst of the strife and after the victory. And all this is done, not by introducing dry moralities, not by breaking loose from the old forms, but by quickening them with another spirit, by substituting the human life for the court life. Trained in stern Hebrew wisdom, possessed with the divinity and the morality of the Hebrew books, he could impart to the classical and the romantic lore, in each of which he excelled all his contemporaries, a new meaning, and yet the very meaning which we feel must always have been latent in them. But all would have been in vain if he had been merely

a scholar, and had not felt that scholarship is meant to penetrate and explain the work of the world.

That the literature which was most popular after the Restoration sought for leisure as its ally, I am not disposed to deny; nor yet that the scholastic learning of that time often claimed the same companion, and shut itself out from the society of men. But the *most* learned men were, on the whole, the most practical. In the practical devotion of Jeremy Taylor, in the practical sense of South, lies the strength of each. The great essayists of the reign of Queen Anne did not fancy that literature ought to be separated from business. Addison may not have been a good Secretary of State; but if he had thought that the business of a Secretary of State had nothing to do with the business of a Man of Letters, we certainly should not have had the 'Freeholder,' probably not the 'Spectator.' The charm of Addison, as it is of the writer who most resembles him in our day, lies in the union of the humane spirit of the man of letters with the wisdom which can only have been acquired by the man of business. We are taking counsel with one who knows the world better than we do, but who is also a friend able to help us in thinking as well as in acting.

There is, however, an amazing difference between those writings of the beginning of the last century and the delightful author to whom I have just alluded. You might read through the 'Spectator' and the 'Guardian' without fancying that there were any people besides ladies and gentlemen and their servants

in God's universe. If the author of the 'Friends in Council' has discovered another set of inhabitants in our planet, and considers that it is a great part of his vocation and of ours to help them, no one would be more willing to allow, than he how much he is indebted for his better state of mind to events which have happened and to persons who have lived between Addison's age and his. Every one now will recognise in the great Methodist movement of the last century a power which called an outlying world of animal existence into moral existence. Almost every one will see in one of the great enemies of that movement, Samuel Johnson, a sign that the refined age with which the century began was passing by degrees into a rough and working age,—that the scholar was not to hope much more from the patronage of kings and nobles. Of Johnson's life, in this point of view, I can have nothing to say which has not been anticipated by Mr. Carlyle; and I should be afraid of showing, by some unfortunate phrase, that Johnson is less a hero with me than he is with him. As a proof that Learning and Work are more nearly associated in the lives of eminent men in later days, as in earlier ones, than Learning and Leisure, I may claim both the facts of Johnson's life and, what is of no less weight, the authority of his panegyrist.

There is one more name to which I must allude, though I am again venturing on ground which Mr. Carlyle has travelled, and this time with the enthusiasm of a patriot as well as of a hero-worshipper. When

I speak of Robert Burns, it is not with the intention of descanting upon his powers, far less of demanding any new wonder for them. How good it would have been for him and for his contemporaries if they had wondered less, if it had seemed to them nothing at all surprising that an Ayrshire peasant should think more freely and speak more nobly than those who had been trained amidst the forms of artificial life, who were in less close intercourse with that which is native and homely! For then they would have sought less to remove him out of his sphere into theirs; they would have wished more to profit by his strength, than that he should be a sharer in their weakness. I hope the ludicrous stories of the behaviour of his patrons to him, the mournful stories of the effects of it upon his own mind, which are gathered together and so effectively brought home to us in Mr. Lockhart's biography, have not been lost upon this generation. I hope all are beginning to learn that the profession of Van Amburgh is by no means the most honourable or the most safe of professions. There are better things to be done than to exhibit lions, or feed them or tame them. If we can by any means assist in forming men, for which end we must teach them, and learn from them, not patronise them, that surely will be a better and more healthful work for our age and for the ages to come.

All I have endeavoured to do in this Lecture is, to show you that the hindrances to this result do not arise from the fact that Work and Learning have a natural antipathy to each other. The practical difficulties in

the present condition of society which hinder their union, which threaten to make the separation wider and more hopeless, I propose to consider hereafter. I shall conclude what I have been saying to-day, by alluding to the subject of which I was speaking at the end of the last Lecture. You may think that my remarks have had an almost exclusive reference to *men*,—that there was something ominous in my beginning from the monastery. On the contrary, I believe that the persons who have reconciled the schools with the world, the life of thought with the life of action, have been women, and, most of all, the women of England. An attempt was made to unite them in the monastery, but it failed, as every attempt must fail ultimately, to do that by our methods which God has done by his methods. Looking at the best female literature of our own and of former days, this, as it seems to me, has been its great function, to claim that all thought shall bear upon action and express itself in action, that it shall not dwell apart in a region of its own. I believe there is another task equally necessary, which it falls, perhaps, more within our province to perform, to show that there cannot be action without thought, that the power to rule the world without must come from the world within. If each sex fulfils its own calling, there will be a blessing, of which others besides those whom we call the working-people will be the inheritors. If either fails, both will suffer, and suffer in a worse way than by the loss of any material advantages. The question has been greatly discussed in our day, what is the force of

the apostolical injunction, "If a man will not work, neither let him eat," and under what limitations it is applicable to us. There is a more terrible sentence still, of which we should seek diligently to avert the execution upon ourselves and upon those who have all they need of outward consolations—"If a man will not work, neither let him think."

LECTURE III.

LEARNING AND MONEY WORSHIP INCOMPATIBLE.

In my last Lecture, I attempted to prove that Learning and Work are not natural enemies, but natural allies. The word *work* I used in the largest sense. From the instance of Dante I argued that the most intense interest in practical politics—even in what we should call factious politics—did not prevent a man in the thirteenth century from being at once a profound schoolman and a divine poet. From the instance of Bacon I drew the inference that a laborious lawyer and statesman might be the reformer and methodiser of physical studies. Undoubtedly the occupations of the Florentine and of the Englishman were not manual; they were working with their brains as priors and as chancellors, not less than when they were composing poems or treatises on the Advancement of Learning. But their occupations were of a kind which are ordinarily supposed to interfere with the pursuit of science and literature. Leisure from these toils has been esteemed even more necessary to secure calmness and extent of knowledge for the student, than freedom from manual exercises, which it is admitted may, under cer-

tain limitations, be a variety for his mind, and be healthful to his body. If, however, proofs were wanted that manual labour not taken up at hazard, or merely for change and recreation, but wrought into the tissue of the life, did not interfere with thought and with letters, there was the example of the Benedictine monks, with which I began,—there was the example of Robert Burns, with which I concluded. Labour was enjoined upon the one as the very condition of their social existence, as necessary to their devotion and their learning. The labour of the Scotch peasant was not only appointed for him from his birth; he owed to it his truest and highest inspirations.

This evidence, if it is earnestly considered, will, I think, suggest the reply to an argument against the possibility of educating, in any regular manner, those who are always at work, which I hinted at in my last Lecture, but which I took no pains to confute. 'Even,' it has been said, 'the activity of those in the upper and 'middle classes of society who impose upon themselves 'the duty of speaking and presiding at assemblies, be-'nevolent, literary, and religious, evidently prevents 'them from thinking steadily and continuously; it 'makes them quick and ready in retailing what has 'been wrought out by others and sanctioned by the 'voice of the circle in which they move, but incapable 'of increasing our supplies of wisdom or of pointing us 'to springs from which it may be renewed. How much 'more incredible,' the reasoner continues, 'is it that 'men who work every day, who work because they 'must, who work at tasks in general mechanical and

'not intellectual, should ever do more than sip for a 'chance moment at the streams or the puddles of know-'ledge, not having time to ascertain even whether they 'are clear or muddy!'

If it were true that the worker is only a bustler under compulsion, this conclusion would be irresistible. But the worker is emphatically *not* a bustler; he cannot be one. To fulfil his character, he must go on steadily from step to step; there must be no hurry, and no intermission. And he is continually reminded how little he can do, how much is done for him. He can, according to Bacon's grand aphorism, but bring two things together, or separate them; the rest nature transacts in secret. The fever of the miscellaneous man, of the man who hopes to prevail by his multitude of words, is altogether foreign from him. Just so far as he is a producer, he is silent and calm.

This assertion is equally true of the manufacturer as of the agricultural labourer. I do not undervalue the differences between them. I have already spoken of the life of Burns in the open air, following his plough upon the mountain side, before he went to Edinburgh and became used to saloons, as most favourable to the freedom of his spirit. But the processes which the sower and reaper has to observe, though simpler and more august, are scarcely more exact and successive than those by which the rags grow into paper, or the pin is pointed and headed. There is a law regulating both. If we mean by a law of nature, that which exists independently of man and which he cannot transgress, to which he must adapt himself, then there is a law of

nature for the stocking-weaver as well as for the grazier or the ploughman.

I am told, and I can well believe, that some of our mechanics find an unspeakable delight in studying mathematics; and that amidst the noise of mills, with scarcely any external help, they have made great progress in them. The sense of succession and order has been so much cultivated in them by the pursuits in which they are continually engaged, there is such a witness to them of mighty laws bounding and defining all the material things with which they are conversant, that to find what they find in geometry, the actual principles to which they have been conforming themselves brought out in perfect sequence, must be a satisfaction such as we can scarcely dream of. I remember well how we used to remark at Cambridge the head and face of the Northern who was most likely to be fashioned into a wrangler. Evidently his preparation had been one of work, of converse with realities much more than of initiation into books. Many of us could scarcely understand what in the world we had to do with mathematics; they mingled so little with the thoughts that had most occupied us. The Northern found in them answers to questions which he had encountered. He was not forming a first awkward acquaintance with unsympathising lines and circles; they were old friends. The strict demonstration was the beautiful harmony of that which had been crude and discordant in his mind hitherto.

If you read the biographies of such men as Arkwright and Brindley, you may trace the curious and interesting

process by which those who have been busy only with coarse mechanical employments waken up to the perception of powers which they are themselves wielding, of laws which govern these powers, of the way in which the powers, intelligently and lawfully used, may produce the newest combinations and the mightiest effects. We who are dazzled by these combinations and effects,—in the case of Arkwright, especially I am afraid, by the great capital which he accumulated,—forget the painful throes of discovery, the mysterious struggles in the man himself, before he could understand his own meaning, or bring it to light. But there are some who think the human soul more precious than the spinning-jenny. They will dwell upon the steps that led to the invention with more wonder and awe than upon all its material results. They will find in those steps, the hints of that which exists hidden from others, hidden from himself, in every mechanic, and which it is worth more pains to call forth than to produce all the cotton which shall be produced while the world lasts.

Let us then thoroughly assure ourselves, that there is nothing in industry itself of any kind, agricultural or manufacturing, nothing in the most steady, persevering, creative industry, to hinder steady, persevering, creative thought. It should be further understood, that there is nothing in the meeting together of a great number of men under one roof for the purpose of work, which can be unfavourable to their learning. That must be a vast advantage in every way. Intercourse must be better than solitary toil. The discipline and arrangement which arises from the apportionment of tasks to one

and to another, must assist in cultivating those habits of order and of distinction which the student needs. Nor can the toil be at all the worse, because it is pursued for the sake of a livelihood. That circumstance, taken by itself, gives greater solidity and earnestness to the labour, and to the mind of the labourer. And that this livelihood is not to be for the worker only, but for a wife and children, is an inconceivable blessing. Domestic sympathies and hopes are everything to the manual worker. They are everything, also, to the intellectual worker. Their close relationship to each other is proved in no way more clearly, than by the help and refreshment which both derive from this source.

And yet—there is no use in concealing it—facts seem to show that, in this country, the class of mechanics as a class are not disposed to connect study with work, even when the greatest pains are taken and the most reasonable methods used, to point out the bond which there is between them. I will remind you of one or two experiments which have been made for this end, and of the success which has attended them.

The Mechanics' Institute is entitled to the first place. We owe it to the benevolence and the wisdom of the late Dr. Birkbeck. The name denoted very successfully the object of its founder. He was not providing an instruction for the poor as poor. He was not looking above the poor to the class of shopkeepers and tradesmen. He was distinctly aiming at those who were working with their hands, or working with any other machine. He acknowledges them not as hands or as machines, but as men capable of being instituted or

educated into a knowledge of the work they were engaged in. That was evidently Dr. Birkbeck's object. He would have a race of intelligent craftsmen, of men who knew what they were about, who were not merely doing to-day what they did yesterday, because they did it yesterday. The idea is a most precious and fertile one. There is a hint in it which I hope to follow out in these Lectures, and which I am therefore most anxious that you should refer to the person, who did so much to give it form and to make it effectual in his own time. Thoughts having such a purpose could not be wasted, even if one plan or a hundred plans that were built on them proved abortions. But the Mechanics' Institutes have not been abortive. They have produced good amidst great discouragement, while many of us, who should have taken part in them, have looked on coldly and indifferently. To a certain class of young men in towns, they must often have been very serviceable. The class, however, has not in general been the one which Dr. Birkbeck sought to help. The tradesman has rather taken the place of the mechanic. Of course, one does not grudge him this or any other intellectual privilege; but the character of the teaching has been, I suspect, insensibly altered in consequence of the persons who receive it. They do not come to the lecture-room, so much to be instructed respecting the meaning of their own occupations, as to acquire general information on a great many topics. Hence there is frequently a complaint, that the lectures in Mechanics' Institutes rather graze the surface of men's minds than penetrate into them. The evil will probably be much abated if the

scheme proposed by the Society of Arts takes effect, and the different institutions throughout the land look to a common centre. Still it is scarcely to be hoped that they will ever supply the most serious necessities of the working people. We may be thankful enough, that they have borne and do bear witness to the existence of those necessities.

The founders of the Evening Classes for Young Men have profited by the experience of the Mechanics' Institutes, and have avoided their greatest danger. In them the pupils learn, and do not merely listen. The teacher gives lessons, not lectures. The experiment is a very noble one, and is a great step towards a methodical education. If the classes were more connected together, if the teachers thoroughly understood each other, they might be still more useful. But these classes consist, I believe, almost exclusively of clerks in offices and young men from shops. They are professedly for their use, and therefore they fulfil their object more completely than the Institutes, which were meant for journeymen.

Before these classes were commenced, an effort had been made, upon the success of which *their* success must mainly depend. If shops are open till eight or nine in the evening, the time which the shopmen or shopwomen can have for improving themselves must be very short indeed, and their weariness must make that short time often nearly useless. Hence the movement for closing shops at six or seven. A more desirable object than this we can scarcely think of. The attempt has been as successful as its promoters had any right to

expect it would be, though far less successful than its intrinsic merits and their zeal and fidelity entitled it to be. Like all attempts to remove a wrong and to do right, it has consequences beyond the immediate one at which it aims. To hear men asserting continually that the gains of trade are not worth the sacrifice of the bodies and souls of those who are engaged in it, is very profitable to us; infinitely more profitable, because we are inclined to dismiss the assertion as a mere idle and tiresome truism which we all believe; whereas we do not believe it, any of us. We may believe that it is very shocking for tradesmen to sell goods which cost the price of blood: but we do not think it at all shocking that we should buy at the same price, though abstinence must of course be far less serious to us. The great good the abettors of this movement have done and are doing, is that they appeal to the consciences of the consumers more than of the sellers; that they remind each of us of his own responsibility, when we are inclined to shift it upon others. And they teach us, moreover, when we are about to make some great display of benevolence and self-sacrifice, that if we are really minded to help our fellow-creatures, very little acts, or the not doing certain things we have been in the habit of doing, would be immeasurably more to the purpose.

But this scheme, though set on foot expressly for the purpose of enabling hard-worked men to obtain leisure for study in the evening, does not apply to mechanics. With them it is perhaps scarcely popular, since they are obliged to make any purchases which they have to

make at the end of the day. They have, however, begun to urge the importance of short hours in their own work. This was one of the principal demands in the engineering strike of the year before last. It was put expressly on the ground that the workmen had not time for the cultivation of their minds. I have no doubt that the argument was used sincerely, though possibly if the working people felt that they were obtaining pecuniary benefit by longer hours they might not adhere to their own principle. Still they have distinctly confessed their need of further instruction; they have claimed the means of obtaining it at the hands of those who are using their work; they have given us a right to say, 'We will 'do our utmost that you may not be defrauded of that 'which you agree with us in thinking is your rightful 'inheritance.'

This is an effort towards the union of Learning with Work from the side of the labourer. A still more systematic effort to bring about this union has been made on the side of the employer. The conductors of the Belmont Factory have not merely abridged the hours of labour for the sake of affording time for education. They have sanctioned the great principle which the Monasteries first inculcated, that an alternation of Labour and Study is the proper law of human life. They have had the courage actually to carry this principle into practice. Nor have they confined themselves to the boys and girls of the establishment. Mr. Wilson's letters show that he is undertaking the education of adults in the noblest spirit. The mixture of manly exercises of the body with those of the mind, and the

thoroughly human character which has been thrown into the whole machinery, make this one of the most striking and pregnant experiments of our time.

But it will not be the blessing to us which it might be, if it does not lead us to reflect on the cause which has rendered most of the attempts to connect Work with Learning which we have made hitherto, so unsatisfactory. I have shown you that Learning has no necessary connexion with *Leisure*. But it has the most intimate connexion with *Rest*. There cannot be two words which represent more different thoughts than these two; there cannot be anything more perilous than the confusion of them. In the old degenerate Monasteries there was plenty of Leisure; everybody was claiming it, seeking for it, inventing methods of enjoying it. But there was no Rest. There was endless hurry and weariness in pursuit of animal enjoyments, and in devising means to kill the time which hung so heavily. We see a number of men in the Universities, a number of men in London, with a prodigious weight of Leisure; but they are certain to be the most restless people we can encounter. On the other hand, if you think of the men to whose biographies I alluded in my last Lecture, you will find that the very painfulness of some of their occupations drove them to seek for a home and a resting place, not by casting them aside, but in the very midst of them. Dante, Hooker, Milton,—it was the same with all. The outward world of worry and turbulence, in and for which they were to work, made it more abundantly necessary that they should feel after and find an inner world of peace and quietness, to which their spirits

might retreat, which they might feel was as truly *their* dwelling as the confused city or house,—as Florence with its noisy parties, or Aldersgate Street with its noisy boys,—was the dwelling of their bodies. And this they felt to be no special privilege which belonged to them;—they lived to vindicate it for all. They discovered that which the spirit of the stupidest man in Florence or London needed and was craving for.

Now all that education which had so mighty a power over England, which seemed at first to stand aloof from its different occupations, which then blended so wonderfully with them and sustained them, was effectual because it bore this testimony. Warring men were reminded by these schools of a Peace which did not imply the cessation from toil,—'a central Peace subsisting at the heart of endless agitation.' They were led to perceive that there are two kingdoms, one of which is meant for us just as much as the other. How to bring them together, how to hinder them from clashing and interfering with each other, was a great problem, *the* great problem of all. But each was always confessed to be necessary to the other; and there was a secret assurance that if it was so, they could not be confined to two different sets of subjects; that the same man must at the same time be a citizen of both, and that it was his mistake, not the mistake of the order in which he was placed, if there was any divided allegiance, any opposition of interests.

This, it seems to me, is what we were bound to teach our working men, and this is what we have failed to teach them. We are under no obligation

whatever to tell them—the wise man forbids us to tell them—that the former days were better than these. We might have shown them very clearly that these days are better than the former days; better because they offer increased facilities for work; better because we can understand more perfectly the principle which is implied in work; better because nominally and in theory at least we do not divide the schools from common human life as they were once divided. But we can only maintain this boast of superiority, if we regard every man, more thoroughly than our ancestors did, as capable of receiving a wisdom that cannot be gotten for gold, and which the gold and the crystal cannot equal.

Instead of doing this, we have done, I fear, the reverse of this. We have led the labourer to think that the wisdom we possess, and of which we would give a portion to him, *can* be gotten for gold; and that its value can be represented very accurately in gold or silver or copper measures. Whatever kind of instruction we have offered and recommended to him, we have tried by this scale. 'If you will only acquire these 'fragments of physical information, who can tell you 'that you may not be as rich as Sir Richard Arkwright? 'If you only make yourself master of these dogmas of 'political economy, what advantage you will have over 'those about you, who know nothing of the laws which 'regulate wages! If you will but let your children 'swallow these lumps of divinity, there are examples 'without end of well-behaved boys who were sent to 'College, and became in due time Prebendaries and

'Deans, to say nothing of richer stalls that may be 'reserved for them in some other state of existence.' With these and the like pious frauds, together with the comfortable assurance, in the last case, that if they will receive our wisdom they will be saved from the danger of being too wise, we have stuffed the ears of those to whom we might have held out promises and hopes of quite a different kind,—promises and hopes which would not have proved, as these do, utterly disappointing in the millionth case in which they are literally fulfilled,—promises and hopes which do not lead one of our fellow-creatures to think that he is fortunate only when he obtains that which others cannot have.

These arguments, if they stood by themselves, would confute themselves. The working people would have sense to laugh at them; the only effect of our using them would be, that we should increase the suspicion of our honesty which they entertain already. But they conspire with a multitude of other influences which are tending to make Work not that brave, noble occupation of men's hands, which is so beneficial to the labour and the rest of their minds, but a feverish effort to produce quickly that which may look well, and be puffed largely, and be sold at a low rate, to the great loss of the purchaser. The sense of responsibility which led the Greek to be as diligent in working out that part of the statue which would be hidden by the wall of the temple as that part which would be exposed to the eye, because the gods would look upon both, seems to have departed from Christendom, which should cherish it most. The flimsy texture which cannot

instantly be discovered—the carelessness which will only cause some boiler to explode in a distant ocean, where no one will hear who has perished—is considered no outrage upon the modern morality, to which we are training our workmen because we have first imbibed it ourselves.

I am not now to point out the different forms of this trade morality, and to show you how it is affecting all kinds of industry. That has been done frequently and with great ability, by persons who have a much more experimental acquaintance with the subject than I have. I am referring to these maxims now only as they bear upon the *education* of the working classes. I wish you to feel that they are great and permanent hindrances to that education; that to all intents and purposes they make it impossible, by making the ends at which it should aim unintelligible, and by turning the means that would promote these ends into the destruction of them.

If steady work is favourable to Education, unsteady work,—gambling work,—(it is almost profaneness to join two such words together,) must be the most fatal obstacle to it. And the truth must be spoken. We are becoming a nation of gamblers. Life is beginning to be regarded as a shuffling of cards, as a throwing of dice. We do not ask what we are to do, but what is likely to turn up, if we make such and such a cast. Handicrafts, Trades, Professions, are to be undertaken upon a calculation of chances, not from the sense of a vocation. How can we think quietly, how can we pursue science, which only converses with that which *is*, while our

whole minds are busy with possibilities and contingencies?

I state the case in this way, because I wish you earnestly to reflect, 1st. That precisely the same disease which is affecting the working class, is affecting all classes; 2d. That the disease has its root in a habit of mind, which is communicated from the higher classes to the working class; 3d. That there is no way so effectual of restoring the whole of society to its right tone, as by doing what in us lies for the reformation of this portion of it.

We often hear complaints of the habits which young men contract at College, and of the tolerance of these habits by their superiors there. Believe me, you can do more to correct and cure those habits than all the Tutors and Heads of Houses in the world. If you take care that the notion shall be checked among all over whom you have influence, that Money is the measure of worth; that professions exist for the sake of the Money which they bring in; that the acquisition and the accumulation of it is the purpose for which men are to live and die, you will be laying your axe to the root of an evil from which the best sumptuary regulations can only cut off a few branches, if they do not, as is sometimes the case, promote its growth. Now that vulgar belief which is tending to the degradation of the higher study among us, and of all those noble pursuits which directly draw their life from study, is the very one which is making trade insincere and false, the very one which is reducing the labourer into a serf. I use that last phrase advisedly. I wish it to be taken literally,

and I will try to explain why it is not an exaggerated one.

Mr. Southey, when he wrote his 'Colloquies on the State and Prospects of Society,' had a singular advantage. As he was sitting in his study at Keswick, he received a visit from the shade of Sir Thomas More, who brought the wisdom of the sixteenth century to bear on the circumstances of the nineteenth. I cannot claim the benefit of any similar instruction. Ghosts in our days choose both the places and persons they shall visit judiciously. Sir Thomas More knew that he should find at Keswick both a goodly prospect and a most intelligent auditor. But I find in the MSS. of a friend, not very legibly written, the report of a conversation which he states himself to have had in a railway carriage with some person, whom he describes so mysteriously that he may, for aught I can affirm to the contrary, have been a humble contemporary of More, though the style of his discourse may not justify me in attributing it to him or any other accomplished scholar. After some vague and not very intelligible account of his companion's outward appearance, my friend says, 'You will not wonder 'that I was somewhat startled by his first speech. He 'pronounced very emphatically these words, which he 'was reading, I presume, out of a newspaper, "Freedom, 'Civilization, Commerce!" and then added, "Humph! 'These this learned Theban says are the glories of 'England. She will not have any one of the three 'fifty years hence." I was silenced for a moment by 'this outrageous ejaculation; then, remembering the 'book I held in my hand, I asked him whether it had

'been his good fortune to read "Uncle Tom's Cabin?"
'He said, "He knew what was in it." Whether he had
'arrived at his knowledge by the ordinary methods, or
'by some magnetical intuition, he did not explain.
'"And yet you think that England is less free, or likely
'to be less free, than other nations?" "What is there
'in that book to cure me of such an opinion?" "What!
'Does not a particularly intelligent and patriotic writer,
'belonging to the country which calls itself, and is called
'by Europe generally, the freest in the world, speak of
'us and of our possessions as the refuge for the slaves
'whom America keeps in bondage? Is that no evidence
'in our favour?" "Does Mrs. Stowe," he rejoined,
'"explain to you in what Freedom, according to her
'judgment of it, consists?" "Very clearly. She
'makes it evident that a certain class of beings in the
'United States are treated as things, not as persons.
'Therefore, they are subjects of Law only so far as its titles
'have respect to things. They are not eligible to Educa-
'tion, because Education can only deal with persons.
'She does not deny that the maxim on which slavery
'rests often undergoes the greatest modifications in
'practice; happily it contradicts others which men con-
'fess, and upon which they are obliged in a multitude
'of cases to act. But she proves that it exists, and
'that it is productive of the most frightful social anoma-
'lies." "Admirable!" said my companion; "there
'never was a better account of slavery than that. It is,
'however, one that you need not have waited to receive
'from the new world. The history of the old world
'would have taught it to you. The emancipation of any

'people from serfdom, of whatever kind it be, had this 'ground and no other. If there was a sufficiently clear 'and strong testimony that the man, as such, was different 'in kind from the earth on which he worked, from the 'tools which he used, from the sheep and oxen which he 'tended, then in due time he ceased to be a serf. The 'collar which signified that he belonged to such and 'such an estate, to such and such a lord, fell off. Pos-'sibly he began to be a freeholder, not only tilling 'certain acres, but able to transmit them to his children, 'or to hand over the clod to some other who acquired 'the same privilege. More probably he held it under 'some obligations of service to a lord, who owed services 'on his side, the acres under that condition being also 'transmissible. Or he may have held the land at a given 'price, for a certain term; or he may have held it at 'the pleasure of the owner; or he may have had nothing 'to do with land at all; but may have exchanged his 'strength and dexterity and experience, for food and 'raiment, or a dwelling, or the money that was their 'equivalent. Often he may have failed in any one of 'these positions to assert his personal rights, or to secure 'the law as a protector of them. But it was understood 'in all cases that he was free, not because he was a 'holder of land or because he received wages, but that 'he was able to hold land and to exact payment for 'what he did, because he was in essentials like the 'landlord, a moral responsible being even as he was."

'"The priest," I interrupted him, "had great in-'fluence in procuring this emancipation." "No doubt," 'he rejoined. "The priest cared little for the laws of

'particular states, but he claimed all who had the human 'form and features as belonging to a mysterious king- 'dom or divine brotherhood. Where he had faith and 'courage to enforce the claim vigorously and effec- 'tually, he found other influences, often apparently 'clashing and contradictory influences, cooperating to 'bring the goatherd or swineherd, who had always sup- 'posed himself a little better than the goats and swine he 'waited on, into the state of one whom the law guarded, 'and of whom it demanded obedience. But often the 'first emancipation consisted in bringing him to the 'school; he became a student before he became a citizen. 'Of the two, that was felt to be the higher testimony 'to his personality." "The priest," I replied, "must 'often have repented of his own achievements." "As- 'suredly," said the stranger, "he was raising up the 'stoutest champions against his own assumptions, when 'he sought to deal with human beings as if they were 'not persons; as if they had not a higher responsibility 'than to him. He could only break the bonds of the 'serf, in the name of God; by asserting that he claimed 'all as His free servants and children. If he was dis- 'posed, for the sake of his own authority, again to 'controvert that doctrine, it was found too mighty for 'him; the principle once uttered could no more contract 'itself to suit his convenience, than the principle which 'was uttered in Runnymede could contract itself to the 'dimensions which the barons might have thought 'ample enough for it. Principles are terrible things to 'sport with."

"Well," I said, "when one thinks of the state of those

'countries in which the voice of the priest has had no
'effect in emancipating the serf, and where, consequently,
'he may count upon the unbounded reverence of both
'serf and lord, though his own character and intellect
'should be ever so degraded, one may rejoice to live in
'a land where his order has been one means of raising
'men to a position, in which they must and will despise
'him, unless he continues to labour in different circum-
'stances for the same object."

'"Rejoice as you will," replied my unknown com-
'panion, "but answer me plainly; Do you in England
'attach that sense to Freedom which connects it with the
'distinction of Persons and Things? A Freeman, so far
'as I can make out your dialect, signifies in it, one who
'is not a Slave, and a Slave signifies one who does not
'receive wages. Thus the labourer is led to define
'himself, as his superiors have already defined him,
'—a wages-receiving animal. That is his great and
'permanent distinction in God's universe. By that
'sign he is known from the rest of the genus Mam-
malia. Hence he comes to conceive that the great
'end of those who do not belong to his order in creation,
'is to prevent him from rising into theirs, and to
'keep down his wages while he continues where he
'is. Laws often appear to him to have been con-
'structed and to be maintained, chiefly for this end.
'Literature, he believes, has ministered to the same
'end very effectually, in those who possess it. He
'would like to remake the laws, because he might then
'have a chance of raising himself to the level of those
'who he believes are depressing him. He would like to

'obtain education that his labour may fetch more in the 'market, that it may at last obtain for itself that which 'he thinks has been granted to its enemies." "This 'may be the state of mind among some of the working 'people," I said; "I am sure it is not among all." '"Thank God," he replied, "that it is not; and if that 'better mind dwells also in your divines, economists, 'statesmen—if they do not regard wages as the cha- 'racteristic difference between the free labourer and the 'serf—you may yet retain the best and worthiest of 'your three treasures; if not, was I not wrong in fixing 'so long a term as fifty years for your tenure of a gift 'which you have already forfeited?"

'I mused on the prophecy, half in sadness, half in 'anger, and did not for some time allude to the second 'word. But, like Mr. Tennyson, "we waited for the 'train at Coventry,"—a delay which, alas! was to pro- 'duce no Lady Godiva,—and then I asked him "whether 'he had not seen enough in our journey from the great 'towns of the North, to convince him that our *Civilization* 'at least had reached a very high pitch, and was based 'upon a very strong foundation." "Its high pitch," he 'said, "I never disputed." "It is the soundness of the 'foundation, then, you question?" "No!" he replied, "I 'believe your civilization has a very deep foundation. 'There," pointing me to the Court-house in Coventry, '"you may read, better than in Guizot, the story of its 'origin and of its growth. You will find in the verses 'round the walls an account of the way in which our 'ancestors became civil, because they became citizens. 'You will see how closely the rise of our manufacturing

'industry was connected with the feelings of citizenship,
'of a common corporate life of union and fellow work."
'"I suppose," I said, "the life in Coventry was some-
'thing like the life in Ghent, which Mr. Taylor has so
'well described to us in his Philip Van Artevelde. And
'yet in the quotation from Hobbes with which he
'introduces it, he speaks of 'the absence of arts, letters,
'society—of the life of men as solitary, poor, nasty,
'brutish, and short.'" "I think," he said, "Mr. Taylor's
'poem is immeasurably better than his quotation, and
'is the true comment upon it. There *was* brutishness
'enough in these citizens; but what brutes they would
'have been—you would have been—if they had not
'sought for that corporate life; if they had not aspired to
'the dignity and responsibility of citizens! Now, do
'you mean *this* by civilization—you Englishmen of the
'nineteenth century? Do you not mean just the reverse
'of this by it? Do you not mean exactly that life
'which is so solitary, and brutish, and nasty; the life
'of men not working together, but working against
'each other, in strife and rivalry and hatred? And do
'you seriously believe that a civilization so inconsistent
'with the principle out of which it has grown—which
'is implied in its continuance—can last fifty years?"

'I had one last resource, and I felt it was a strong one.
'I suspected my friend of being a Protectionist. I was
'prepared to overthrow him, with statistics about our
'commercial progress. To my astonishment, he ex-
'pressed unbounded sympathy with my assertion that
'every nation was to seek help from every other; that
'the policy of trying to favour our own productions, and

'to prohibit or check the introduction of those of foreign 'lands, was suicidal. He was willing to admit that the 'freest and largest intercourse was the best; that in 'maintaining it to be so, we are wiser than our fore-'fathers. "Well, then?" I said. "Well, sir, and there-'fore, because you have cast aside all rivalry between 'nations; because you deem the emancipation from it 'the greatest achievement of your age; *therefore* you 'will use your commerce only to promote the most 'wearisome, exhausting, destructive rivalry between 'your own subjects; to make every member of a house-'hold the rival, and in the end the destroyer of every 'other! That is the *Commerce* which is to sustain itself 'for fifty years!"'

I have quoted the words of this mysterious critic upon our country's condition, because I believe they express the thoughts of a great many foreigners who look at it with no unfriendly eyes, and of many a native who feels for it with the anxiety and tenderness of a lover or a child. They have led a few to adopt conclusions and to enter upon courses of action, which probably you will not approve, and which I am not here to defend, though I am bound to express my hearty sympathy with them. To deliver the working people from the notion that they are merely wages-receiving animals, and their superiors in rank and position from the corresponding degradation of being regarded as merely wages-paying animals, it has seemed to them worth while to try whether bodies of workmen might not be associated, for their own profit, under a government not less strict, but more paternal, than that to which they are ordinarily sub-

jected. It has struck them, that almost any risk should be incurred, and of course the very trifling risk of being called hard and ugly names, for the sake of making the labourers understand that citizenship is a reality, that civilization is not a curse, that the same power which enabled their forefathers to work together in spite of all the tendencies to solitude and rivalship in the fourteenth century, can enable them to overcome the same tendencies, in the more fortunate circumstances of the nineteenth. They have thought it not unimportant to show that the principle of Trade is reciprocity, not overreaching. I have alluded to this subject because I should be dishonest if I did not confess that I think the reformation must begin at both ends, that we must raise Work to make it fit for association with Learning, as well as bring Learning to bear upon Work. But I am far indeed from thinking that these schemes, or any schemes, have any virtue of their own. Their one use is, that they may help to raise the workman to a sense of manhood and freedom; to the feeling that he is a person and not a thing, a citizen and not a slave. If you can accomplish that end without these means,—if you can make us who resort to them look ridiculous and contemptible, by the better machinery which you bring into play, by the higher spirit with which you set it in motion—God speed you! I am trying to show you that there *is* another method, quite different from the one which I have hinted at, by which you may improve the social position of the mechanic and secure your own. If you acknowledge him as not merely entitled to receive certain crumbs of knowledge which

fall from the rich man's table, to a scrap here and there of irregular, disjointed learning, which is rather a burden to his spirit than a power to raise it, but as intended to share with you the deepest and most universal part of your treasures, those which belong not to classes but to men; if you will dispense these regularly and methodically as if they were portions of our common food, which must be received, and which belong to the life of us all; if you will follow out the hint which Mr. Wilson has given you, and consider that you are making the labour of the hands most effectual when you turn the factory into a school and a home; then indeed you may boast that you are doing infinitely more than all our little efforts, whether reasonable or unreasonable, whether rightly or wrongly directed, have done yet, or could do, if they were ever so much extended, to save the land from serfdom and barbarism. And this I urge not only, not even chiefly, for the sake of those who toil and suffer, but for the sake of those who possess and enjoy. I tremble lest those whose station most demands of them nobleness and chivalry, should shrink into money-getters and money-changers. That calamity will be averted if you will resolve to teach the hardest hands that they were created for other uses than these. God will give manhood to the nobles and gentlemen of England, when they assert that the highest manhood, and therefore that gentleness and nobility, may be called forth in those who are not of higher origin than our tinker poet Bunyan, or than that illustrious Scotsman of our day, Hugh

Miller; who are not richer in this world's goods than were the fishermen of Galilee.*

* The fears with which this Lecture concludes would not have been expressed in the same terms, if it had been delivered in November or December instead of June. The nobles and gentlemen of England *have* shown that the old manhood is in them: the private has abundantly vindicated his share in that manhood. God be thanked for drawing such blessings out of such sorrow! God be thanked for giving us signs and tokens that there is a common heart in the land still! There is enough of miserable partisanship, suspicion, frivolity in us all, to keep us ashamed; enough of personal and national misery to make vaunting and self-glorification more than ever unseemly and monstrous. But the treasure which we thought we had lost, is proved to have been only hidden. Let us take care that the Mammon altar which it has needed, and may need, so much suffering and blood to throw down, shall not be built again. We have asked another God than the money god to lead our hosts. Let us swear that, neither in peace nor in war, shall he reign in our senate, our colleges, or our hearts.

LECTURE IV.

LEARNING THE MINISTER OF FREEDOM AND ORDER.

It will seem to many of you that I have greatly increased the difficulties of the subject I am considering, by the view which I took of Education in my last Lecture. I spoke of an education which should not be merely a supplement to work, but should be incorporated with it; of an education which should speak to those who received it, of rest in the midst of toil, even while it demanded from them toil of another kind; of an education which should make them feel, that the spirit in them has a world of its own, which is as real as that which their senses tell them of. Such language will sound, I doubt not, to a number of practical men, very mystical and absurd, not the less so because I produced evidence that an education such as I described was the one which our forefathers established in this country, the one which our old schools and colleges with their monastical and picturesque associations remind us of, if they do not impart it. 'That would be a decisive 'proof,' I shall be told, 'were proofs necessary, that

'*we* want something altogether different. The age that 'gave birth to those institutions was an age of dreamers; 'ours is one of workers. To reproduce the temper of 'that time, is happily impossible; to reproduce the 'forms of it, is ridiculous. We are born among factories 'and railways, and we must make the best of them That last proposition expresses my own abiding conviction. I believe we are born among factories and railways, and that it is good for us that we are. Far from participating in the contempt which some whom I admire have expressed for them, I believe that they are gifts of God, and reasons for thankfulness, just as beautiful cathedrals and beautiful paintings are. I have expressed already a profound reverence for the achievements of modern industry, and have maintained that the learning which despises or overlooks them, which does not adapt itself to our circumstances, which merely dresses itself out in the garments of the past, cannot be sound or good learning. Nevertheless I fully expect that these professions, however sincere I may know and you may believe them to be, necessarily as they are involved in my arguments against the worshippers of Leisure, will prove light as air when weighed against that one tremendous word, '*Mystical.*' Every aged trader in newspaper enchantments knows the efficacy of that word; he communicates it to the young apprentice as a spell which, though it has been well worked, has still more power than any other to frighten comfortable men not prone to ordinary superstitions, as well as timid women. I fully appreciate the wisdom of those who put this epithet in the front rank, when they seek to demolish a project, a

book, or a character; it will do the work of a hundre facts and of a thousand arguments.

But though the public listens and trembles whenever this word is pronounced, it does not follow that an education possessing somewhat of the 'mystical' character is always the least popular amongst us. Twenty-five years ago, if half-a-dozen intelligent people, acquainted with the tendencies, the strength, the deficiencies of the English character, had been asked what studies would be *most* likely—what would be *least* likely—to spread amongst us, especially amongst our manual workers, they might have given different answers to the first half of the question according to their tastes and propensities. One might have urged the teaching of arithmetic, another of mechanics, a third of economics. But there would have been no dispute about the last half of it. They would have said one and all, 'Whatever other 'instruction you give, leave the fine arts alone. They 'belong to the South. There they have ripened under 'the warm sunshine both of ecclesiastical and state pa- 'tronage; there men in the highest classes cultivate 'them, men in the lowest admire them. The sensuous 'worship gives them a sacred character; they become 'associated with the vulgarest amusements of the pea- 'santry. Everything in the social condition of our 'people, in their hard practical temper, in their religious 'services, is hostile to this sort of cultivation.' And if it occurred to any of the party that possibly some unwashed Morland or Blake or Gainsborough might be dwelling in some unvisited corner of our land, a reluctant exception would perhaps have been made in favour of

111222

Drawing, only that the testimony might be more strong against the possibility of *Music* ever obtaining the slightest hold upon our people. How clearly it would have been explained to us, why voice and ear have been denied to the inhabitant of this island, and why, on the whole, we should rejoice in our freedom from the temptations to which they would expose us! What a number of ingenious theories about races would have been introduced to remove any lingering discontent with our allotment! And if these theories dwelt a little too strongly upon the effect of Italian sweetness and Roman Catholic worship, and so left the fact unexplained that Protestant Germany, with anything but a soft tongue, anything but a warm devotion, had nevertheless given birth to eminent composers and to a people musically inclined, I need not tell any one who knows from experience the elasticity of these philosophical explanations, how easily they would have expanded to take in this new and troublesome case—the speculative or mystical character of Germany always coming in as a resource to prevent us from building any vain hopes upon our community of blood. Well, it has appeared in the result, that these clear and irresistible reasonings belong to the same class with the solutions which the members of the Royal Society, shortly after its foundation, sent in to the celebrated problem of Charles II. respecting the fish which did not displace the water. There was no problem to be solved; the fact so well accounted for was not a fact.

Of all experiments in English education, beyond comparison the most successful has been that for diffusing a knowledge of music and a love of music among our

people. The Mechanics' Institutes have attracted a few men here and there, and those generally not mechanics; the classes of Mr. Hullah have brought thousands together of both sexes, in London and in every part of England. Every order down to the lowest has felt the impulse. I am credibly informed that instead of merely hearing lectures about singing, numbers have actually learned to sing. I am sure no one can look at their faces at one of their great meetings, and not perceive with what hearty delight and with what comparative indifference to mere display and effect, they exercise their gift.

I am willing to admit that this proof is not absolutely decisive. There has been no one working in any other department of popular education with the same thorough zeal and geniality which Mr. Hullah has thrown into this. We cannot tell that the same energy exerted elsewhere might not have produced results as remarkable. Let us assume that it might have done so, and hope that it will do so yet. But men generally appear when they are wanted, to do the thing that wants to be done. There have been indications in various quarters that a craving both for instrumental and vocal music *has* been awakened among mechanics in London and the provinces, indications which I believe we ought to consider as distinctly providential. Few persons have less motive to estimate them highly than I have; few, from utter ignorance of the whole subject, would be more inclined to overlook them. But it is impossible not to confess that they are the most significant facts which have yet come under our notice, facts which from their strange-

ness and their inconsistency with all our anticipations, require to be reflected on. Music will never, surely, occupy a most conspicuous place in any good scheme of education. But if it has taken stronger hold of those whom we desire to educate, than any other study has done, especially if it has laid hold of them when we thought that any other study was more in agreement with their previous tastes and habits of mind, there must be something in it which may help us to understand what is needed in all studies, something which may deepen and widen our thoughts respecting the nature of education itself. I need hardly tell you that it is no novelty to think thus; that it is an opinion which carries as great a weight of authority in its favour as any we can adopt. One whole book of 'Plato's Republic' is given to the subject of music as an instrument of education. He was but commenting on a pursuit which already formed a capital part of his country's discipline; and he felt that portion of it to be so important for good and for evil—he felt that besides being Athenian it was so Greek, and that besides being Greek it was so human—that a careful criticism of the kinds of music which were likely to nerve and elevate, or to weaken and lower the character, was not out of place in a work written to teach Athenians, Greeks, and men, the principles on which they must live together, and the methods by which they might become practically united. Strictly in the spirit of Plato, but still more in the spirit of those Hebrew sages from whom he had learned his highest wisdom, Milton insists in his Letter to Mr. Hartlib, that the pupils in his imaginary

college should 'recreate and compose their travailed 'spirits with the solemn and divine harmonies of music 'heard or learnt, either while the skilful organist plies 'his grave and fancied descant in lofty fugues, or the 'whole symphony with artful and unimaginable touches 'adorn and grace the well-studied chords of some choice 'composer; sometimes the lute or soft organ stop wait-'ing on elegant voices either to religious, martial, or 'civil ditties, which if wise men and prophets be 'not extreamly out, have a great power over disposi-'tions and manners, to smooth and make them gentle 'from rustick harshness and distempered passions.' It is pleasant to have the strength of such names and such words; yet, I must repeat it, I do not touch upon the subject in deference to them, or from a wish to copy the older schools of England, but because the mechanics of the nineteenth century are manifesting their desire for these influences, and because it greatly imports us to inquire what is the root of this desire, as well as how it may be unfolded, and led to embrace other objects not less lovingly and cordially than this.

To understand this question rightly, you must put yourselves in the place, not exactly of some utterly dull and incapable listener like myself, but, of some simple clown, all whose work has been of the roughest kind, but who has had a father and mother, perhaps a wife and children, and who possesses the strange power which it has never occurred to him to think about, of recollecting that which has been in his own life, of anticipating that which shall be. Very strange! This

clown is a creature that looks before and after. All the economy of his existence is adapted to one possessing these faculties; he is descended from those who are in their graves; those are climbing his knees who will be playing or working on this earth when he is in *his* grave. I cannot tell what these strange sounds, so unlike the ordinary discourse which he hears when he is talking about the weather, or buying and selling in the market, mean to him, what kind of message they carry to him; but I am quite sure it has something to do with these memories and hopes and fears of his; that it joins itself to a number of vague feelings which he has had about other days, and about faces which he has seen and hands which he has pressed; that it gives them a kind of distinctness which they had not before. I cannot explain how this comes to pass, and I am sure he could not. The music speaks to something within him which the ordinary language does not speak to, something more near his own very self, touching wires which that language does not reach, and making them vibrate. If any one likes to call this a mystical expression, he is at full liberty to do so. I might justify myself by saying that Hartley, whose philosophy is the idol of some of our practical people, uses the same phraseology; that he has a much more complete theory of vibrations than I can even dream of. But I put forward no such justification. I will give up my mode of stating the case as mystical and good for nothing, the moment you will furnish me with another which describes the facts more adequately. I only desire to get them acknowledged. This Memory, which the ancients

called the mother of arts, may not be that, but a very vulgar simple thing, which we can all define and understand. This Hope, with which not only the bloom but the substance of our being seems to be involved, may, when it is submitted to a satisfactory analysis, shrink into a very obvious, intelligible, unmarvellous quality; I have no doubt that it will. But I am not speaking of either in this refined state; I am speaking of them as they rise in the heart of a day labourer. To him they are wonderful; and the music which mingles so curiously and intricately with them, is wonderful also. It must depend, I suppose, very much upon the care of those who provide it for him, whether it shall awaken only some slight and momentary titillation of pleasure, or the deepest and most energetic thoughts; whether it shall be impressed into the service of his ordinary habits of thinking and acting, and receive its shape and hue from them, or shall be instrumental in raising them and giving them a nobler form and brighter colouring; whether it shall be the vision of an occasional luxury which the rich man may enjoy to surfeiting—he only at rare intervals—or whether it shall speak to him of a divine order which was before the discords of earth began, which works on in the midst of them, and into which the pure of heart, who prefer their human heritage to any other, may freely enter. Yet even the vulgarest street music is an education to the hearts of those who stand at the doors of pestilential dwellings to listen to it. Till that day which shall unseal all pent-up words and reveal the secrets of all hearts, it may not be known what thoughts have been stirred up in human spirits by

sounds that fell utterly dead upon our ears; what authentic tidings of invisible things came to them through those channels when other avenues seemed to be closed; what awakenings of conscience, what aspirations after truths never yet perceived, what search for treasures that had been lost. Some of the most beautiful passages of modern as of ancient poetry turn upon the stories of fishermen and shepherds who were tempted by siren visions, that spoke to them of some fairer regions, for which it were well to desert the dreariness of their earthly occupations, even at the risk of plunging into the deep. Besides the wonderful ballad of the German poet, there is that exquisite passage in Mr. Landor's 'Gebir,'—

> 'But I have sinuous shells of pearly hue
> Within; and they that lustre have imbibed
> In the sun's palace porch, where when unyoked
> His chariot wheel stands midway in the wave.
> Shake one, and it awakens; then apply
> Its polish'd lips to your attentive ear,
> And it remembers its august abodes,
> And murmurs as the ocean murmurs there.'

I feel that the beauty of such conceptions lies in their essential truth. The shepherds and fishermen of our land, as of every land, hear these whispers, have these dreams. They need an interpreter; if they do not find one, they may give heed to any tempter who would lead them into the most perilous depths or the most wretched shallows. The last calamity is the greater of the two. To have any gratification for such longings is almost better than to have them stifled and killed.

I trust, then, you will see why I attach such import-

ance to this movement towards musical education. First, because it is useless to impart what men are not willing to receive, and here is an index of what they *are* willing to receive. Secondly, because it seems to me a most healthful instinct which has led them, while comparatively indifferent to much that has been offered to them, to select what we perhaps should have called a mere amusement or gratification. If the higher classes have made it a mere amusement or gratification, so much the worse for them. I believe to the working people it must be more than that, or it will not be that. But I trace in this appetite for music cravings, which I believe to be the deepest that there are in man, —the most indispensable to every Englishman,—the cravings for *freedom* and for *order*. I believe that all education is intended to excite these cravings, and to meet them; that only so far as it effects these objects does it deserve its name.

This is no new doctrine. We have all of us proclaimed in one form or another our belief that freedom is not merely a collateral blessing of education, a condition on which it exists, but that it is the end at which it aims. For instance, we have most of us spoken some strong words about the Jesuit schools. If these words expressed a censure of the plans which are adopted in the Jesuit schools, they were not justifiable; for all plans must be considered in reference to the purpose which they are designed to accomplish, and tried by that standard I imagine few would be found more ingenious or perfect than those which this order has devised. If, again, they convey a oose condemna-

tion of all the teaching which has existed in schools that have acknowledged or do acknowledge the authority of the Bishop of Rome, they will be unjust and ignorant; for the teaching which existed in our own country and other countries during the middle ages—whether it was good or bad, effectual or ineffectual—was altogether different in its principle, and in its effects, from that which has grown up among the disciples of Ignatius Loyola. What we mean, however confusedly we may sometimes utter our meaning, is that the Jesuits are not seeking to *free* the spirit of man by their teaching. We have a solid and deep-rooted conviction that their object is the reverse of this; that they look upon the school as one of the instruments, probably the most powerful of all instruments, for preventing the emancipation of the spirit, for keeping it in fetters. That is our ordinary English opinion. I am not going to argue in defence of it, though I thoroughly and inwardly believe it to be true; and though that persuasion makes it a question of great indifference to me whether the other statements about the Jesuits are true or not. I do not want any black and all black Eugene Sue portraits of some inconceivable monsters of fraud and iniquity, who at the same time are able, in virtue of their fraud and iniquity, to direct all the movements of the world. I am glad to get any facts, or even any tolerable testimonies, to authorize me in distrusting representations which are in themselves so incredible. I believe Englishmen injure their minds far more than Desdemona injured hers, when they listen to tales of—

"Anthropophagi, and men whose heads
Do grow beneath their shoulders;"

because, when it happens that such reports in one or another case are refuted by the statements of more accurate and sceptical travellers, there is generally a vehement reaction, and the being who was painted as a devil may, with miraculous rapidity, exchange his hoofs for a halo, and obtain an apotheosis. I hold it therefore more safe to dismiss those Gallican extravagancies, and to maintain our old faith, that seeing the Jesuit does not seek to give our sons and daughters freedom, but seeks deliberately, skilfully, systematically, to deprive them of freedom, he is not doing the thing that we want done, he is doing the thing which most of all we want not to be done; and therefore that we must respectfully request him to go his way, while we go ours. If I added any more words, they would be these, that while we are pursuing our own way steadily and manfully, we have not the least reason to be afraid of him, even if he had those superhuman powers which some Infidels and some Protestants attribute to him; and that if we miss our way, or walk along it with faltering, irregular, tipsy steps, he, or any man who knows his goal and works straight for it, must have the advantage of us.

And it is not only when we are opposing others that we inscribe this watchword of Freedom on the same banner with that of Education. This, as I said in my first Lecture, has been the safest boast we have been able to put forth, on behalf of our public schools. 'You may talk,' we have said, 'as you will

'of their imperfections as mere places for communi-
'cating a certain quantity of information. You may
'complain that the sports of the school are its most
'serious business, that the teaching is secondary to
'them. But in some way or other, a free, manly,
'English character is formed in them; men do go forth
'from them who can work with men and for men, who
'have sympathies with them and tolerance for them,
'who are therefore fit to rule them.' Whether this boast is always well founded or not, whatever deductions actual experience may make from it, we at least learn from it what our national standard is, what object our schools set before themselves, whether they reach it or not. And I cannot think that our noblest and most effectual school reformer, Dr. Arnold, ever proposed to himself a different standard from this, or wished that our schools should confess a different object. I think he discovered that, through various causes, they were not forming Englishmen as they were meant to do; that the games were freer than the teaching; that a low, vulgar caste morality was supplanting the brave national morality; that the schoolmaster had become too much identified with the stiff pedant; and therefore that the schoolboy was sinking into the pert coxcomb. He was throughout his life combating the slavish tempers and habits which were warping and undermining the country's heart. In his own sphere, no one combated them so successfully. And since all our public schoolmasters who have attempted reformation, confess that they received their first impulse from him, and that like him they are seeking not to

change but to restore, we may assume that they also look upon English education as intended to bring forth the free English spirit, and so to counteract the narrow and debasing influences,—especially those that grow out of our money worship,—which are conspiring to destroy it.

If, then, we are consistent with our own habitual professions, we must aim in all our teaching of the working classes, at making them free. We know that they feel themselves shackled in a thousand ways; that they ask to be delivered from their shackles. They may be wrong in some of their notions about the *nature* of their bondage; they are not wrong about the *fact* of it. If you think that it is upon their souls, and not upon their bodies, then you will set about emancipating their souls. If the distinction between a freeman and a slave, as Mrs. Stowe has taught us, and many before her, is identical with the distinction between a Person and a Thing, you will seek above all things to make our working people understand that they are Persons, and not Things. Whatever teaching contributes to that end must be good for them, and, as they have shown in the instance of Music, they will by degrees *feel* that it is good for them. Whatever does *not* contribute to it—but leads them to suppose that the things they are working with are more precious than themselves, the workers—must be bad for them; and I believe they will not be induced to seek for it, or to prize it when it is offered to them. I do not say that such teaching, if it comes recommended by men in whom they trust, and who promise them that it will

bring political power, may not be prized, precisely because it appeals to their personal hopes and sympathies; but I do say, that if we try to give them instruction which assumes them only to be hewers of wood and drawers of water, they will prefer to hew their wood and draw their water—I might add, and to drink their gin—without it.

I do not suppose, however, that the *only* end of Education is to make us free. It would not accomplish that object if it did not lead us to perceive an *order* in all that we do, and in all we think. Here, again, I am only enunciating a proposition to which we have all, in some form or other, given an assent. 'Schoolmasters,' says George Herbert, in an often quoted passage, 'deliver us to Laws.' Their business is not to supply a substitute for the paternal government, or for the affection of the mother, but to make us understand the meaning of ordinances which are fixed for a whole society, and cannot be transgressed by any one without bringing down punishment; ordinances which are to be obeyed, because they exist, but which are gradually to make their justice and wisdom apparent to us. These ordinances are not only imposed that the lessons may go on uninterruptedly; they are the most important part of the lesson. They help to make it intelligible to the boy how there should be rules of grammar and composition; how it should be his obligation not to make false concords. On the other hand, the detection of his false concords, and the punishment of them, is part of his initiation into the principles of order. He finds that there are laws of speech which

existed before his day, before his master's day, to which one as much as the other must conform himself. This is discipline and education united; it is the teacher's business to feel their connexion thoroughly himself, that he may, not by formal indoctrination half so much as by his habitual practice, imbue his pupils with the sense of it. By some means or other, the sense of it has passed into the minds of Englishmen,—infinitely less than it ought, but still—as I conceive, so much as to give us great cause for gratitude. There is always danger in vaunting, and when we begin to rejoice that our youths are not subject to a Jesuit ecclesiastical drill or to a Prussian state drill—that their minds are not forced to obey mechanically either a spiritual rule or a military word of command,—we should remember with trembling, that the perversions of the true idea of order and government, which we attribute to people of a different faith or nation from our own, are perversions incident to human nature, and that we have fallen and do fall into them continually. Still the language indicates our feeling of what we ought to be; our true school reformers have so considered it. They have not thanked God that we are not as other men are, but they have thanked Him, for giving us the perception of a principle by which we may measure the irregularities and inconsistencies of our own practice. They have been able to see where despotical caprice in him who administers and executes the school law, or favouritism, or laxity, or a pedantic adherence to rules, has destroyed the moral as well as the intellectual blessing of the discipline, and has introduced an order which is not

the twin sister but the subverter of Freedom, so hindering the pupils hereafter from understanding how God governs and educates his voluntary creatures, as well as the laws which He has ordained that Nature, with its ever fresh powers of generation and production, should obey. For if, as these reformers have well understood, the school is the preparation for the higher culture of the university—which is to open to the pupil, loosened from that preparatory training in forms and accidents, the methods of science, that he may with awe and boldness climb the steps which lead him into the mysteries of the outward universe, and those other steps, not less regular, though apparently broken by man's self-will, whereby he may ascend to the secrets of the moral world, as they are discovered in human and divine history,—to restore that which has become weak or confused in the order of the teaching and of the discipline, is a duty as great as that of making them both minister to freedom, and one which the reformer undertakes in the same spirit, and with the same deliberate courage.

It is for the extension of an education, having this object as well as the former, to working men, that I plead, or, what is much more to the purpose, that they themselves plead. You have mistaken them grievously if you think that they are more sensible of the first want than of the second; that they pant more for freedom than for organization. Many phrases which come from their lips might lead you to that opinion, but if you compare them with others quite as significant, quite as much expressive of their innermost minds, you would often

change it for the opposite. No feeling, I am thoroughly convinced, is so alive with them, as the wish to find an order of which they themselves are a living part, or, which is the alternative if that wish is denied them, to make one. And if you study carefully their acts as well as their words,—if you read, for instance, in an impartial spirit, without any bias towards the employer or the workman, the history of the late Preston strike,—you will perceive in them, even at times when the spirit of insubordination was likely to be strongest, a sense of order and self-restraint, a submission to government and a capacity for it, which prove that we may receive much from them, as well as impart something to them. And this we must learn from that and all similar examples,—that the order of society, like the order of nature, was not created by us for our convenience, and cannot shape itself according to our convenience; that we are all its subjects; that it asserts itself; that it avenges itself; that we are humbly and devoutly to ask what its demands upon us are, and whence we can obtain the power of fulfilling them. Then when we have received a little of this wisdom, which sages in their books and the experience of history have tried to impress upon us, we may be able to raise our working people out of some of the delusions to which they as well as we are prone. We may lead them to perceive, since we shall have first perceived it ourselves, that obedience is not hard and servile compulsion; that politics are not created in conformity to certain theories of ours; that the irregularities and crimes and tyrannies of men imply a divine order, of which they are the

transgressions; that every piece of machinery—that the commonest acts of those who use machinery — indicate the divine laws to which the sun and stars do homage. We may show them that the instinct which led them to listen with wonder and delight to musical chords is not a merely sensual one; that it is a witness to the truth of that inward primal harmony in nature and in the fellowship of men, which the ancients represented in their fables, when they spoke of the music of the spheres, and of cities rising at the sound of the lyre.

However strange the assertion may sound, I believe it is in this way we may best hope to engage our working men in the study of the commonest things, as well as of severer science. The phrase, *teaching of common things*, has of late acquired great interest for us, through the valuable hints which Lord Ashburton has thrown out on the subject, and the practical experiments by which he has enforced his hints. Nothing, I conceive, can be more true than the assertion, that we have been eager to teach working men, as well as other men, *uncommon* things, while the things which are lying at their feet, those which are occupying them every day, those which affect the economy of their daily lives, are disregarded. If we can recal them to those things, if we can persuade them to think about those things, the moral benefit to them will be greater even than the external advantage. For a man seriously to meditate how he may prevent the rain from coming through his roof, or how he may convert his dwelling from a sty for pigs into a house for his wife and children, is better

for him than to have notions and speculations, nay, even *bonâ fide* knowledge, about the courses of the planets and the history of mankind. No proposition, I am satisfied, can be sounder than that; and any means which are taken to make it more than a proposition, to turn it into use, must be fruitful of good. The good, I apprehend, will be especially of this kind. These common things have to do with human life, especially with domestic life. Instead of withdrawing the man from his home, they connect his studies with it. Things,—common things,—are instruments of raising the man morally, of making him less the slave of his circumstances, since he finds that he can mould and dispose them. The belief that he can substitute order for disorder in the arrangements of his household, is an immense and unspeakable improvement to his intellect and character. It cultivates in him that perception of order I have been speaking of. I trust, therefore, that this experiment may be fully worked out, and that no apparent disappointment may cause it to be abandoned, or check the hopes which it has excited, especially for the agricultural labourers, in many minds.

Such disappointments, I think, may arise from several causes. We all know, from our personal experience, that it is not enough to say to us, 'You would be 'much wiser if you did not trouble yourself about great 'matters which do not concern you; about events in 'the Baltic and Black Sea; about Russian aggression 'or Austrian diplomacy. Have not you business enough 'to do in your own village, in your own house? Why 'should you be sending your thoughts to the ends of

'the earth, when you might concentrate them there?' Such words, I am sure, make many of us very much ashamed when we hear them. They touch our consciences. We *have* many accounts unsettled in our own circles; we cannot pretend any special call to Cronstadt or Sebastopol; we are not likely to sway the counsels of Vienna or Petersburgh. Nevertheless, there lies the newspaper on the table; under protest, we turn to it again. The subject has an indescribable interest for us. When we come to question ourselves, we cannot find out that our other work would be better done, if we stifled that instinct. It might be immeasurably better done if that instinct took a stronger and healthier form. If, instead of yawning over the latest intelligence or the leading article, we seriously felt for the human beings and the human interests that are involved in those distant transactions, the human interests and human beings that are nearer to us might rise also in our estimation; we might feel more our duties to them, more the power we have of benefiting them.

It seems to me that, in like manner, working men, who are living with each other in shops, factories, public houses, who hear and talk, who read newspapers, may listen to our call that they should mind the common things of their household, and may in part admit the reasonableness of it, but that they will in a majority of cases still find the distant and comprehensive subjects more engaging. When that is not the case, it will be because they have *already* acquired a sense of moral responsibility which leads them to feel most strongly the obligations that are closest to them. I dare not say

that the man who has this sense of responsibility will be the one who gives up his patriotism, who ceases to care for that which affects his country. I dare not wish to deprive him of any one interest that is even half awake in him already. I should rather wish to arouse it into full consciousness, and this for the sake of the other object. The paradoxical proverb is a true one, that the longest way round is the shortest way home. The labourer may arrive at his home through Cronstadt and Sebastopol, whilst the quicker route might have brought him, not to his family, but only to his chimney corner; not to think of *common* things, but only of those which are purely and exclusively his own.

The great problem of all, then, is how to make men know that they are persons, and therefore that freedom and order are their necessary and rightful inheritance. There may be various ways of solving this problem. One of them may be, by teaching household economy; one of them may be, by teaching what many call an accomplishment, a refinement. I do not care what influence you bring to bear upon the man, provided it does its work,—provided it arouses him to be a man. Common things or uncommon, fine arts or coarse arts, which promote that object, are all precious. To reject one or another upon a theory is rash. We cannot in the least pronounce *à priori* which will meet particular cases or emergencies best. The success of Mr. Hullah's classes proves, as I have shown already, how much all previous conjecture, however practical, however apparently built on observation, may mislead us. I know but three rules which we can follow in forming a scheme of education.

The first, is to be clear about our objects. The second, is to study the tempers of those whom we would guide. The third, is to plagiarise without remorse from all our predecessors.

I am about to confess my own plagiarisms from two parties which are supposed to be in deadly hostility to each other, and both of which have some excuse for anathematising me. In maintaining that any study whatsoever, music, arithmetic, or that of common things, is an instrument of which we may make use, *even if we have no other*, in educating working men, or indeed men of any class, I have adopted the maxim of those who call themselves supporters of a purely Secular Education. They ask why we are not at liberty to teach what we can, supposing it is not in our power to teach what we would?—whether it is not a strange thing to prefer no instruction, to a scheme from which religious instruction is excluded?—whether we really think a man the worse for having got wisdom on some subjects, because he has not got it on that which we deem most important? —whether we believe that enlightenment on the ordinary business of life is a disqualification for the higher lessons we would communicate?—whether, if that is the case, there is not good reason to suspect that these lessons are not what they ought to be, not what are likely to make free and brave English citizens? These, I think, are perfectly reasonable questions, all the better because they are searching. I have answered the main one already. I am equally ready to answer those which are subordinate to it. I own at once that I should be afraid that I was deceiving myself about the quality of

any religious instruction I ventured to offer, to any person whatever, if I thought ignorance, dulness, torpor of the mental faculties, would be a helpful precondition to his receiving it; if I did not wish that he should be as wide awake as he could be; if I did not hail any agency that had stirred up his faculties, even though the immediate effect of the stirring might be to make him regard me and that which I have to tell him, with irritation, with suspicion, with aversion. I speak these words deliberately, understanding something of what is involved in them, and not shrinking from any application of them that I am as yet acquainted with. And therefore, if this were all that the advocates of secular instruction intended by their doctrine, I might ask for admission into their guild. But I have already made statements which prevent me from pretending to that honour. I have spoken of men as spiritual beings. I have only justified the musical education on the ground that it arouses men, shut up in the dreariest mechanical employments, even sunk in moral debasement, to a feeling of their spiritual existence, to the consciousness of belonging to another economy than that which is conversant with the making or selling of commodities. I have supposed freedom and order to be impossible for men except as they come to understand that there is this higher economy for them; that they are not enclosed within the boundaries of the lower. With the Secularists, so far as they deny this principle, I am at issue, not about points and deductions, but about *data;* about the very end for which Learning exists, and for the sake of which it is to be associated with Working. I can see

no outcome from this project when it takes this form, but that which Mr. Dickens is so vividly setting before us in his sketches of the family of Mr. Gradgrind, a gentleman who announces himself as the great champion of 'facts,' but who, if I understand his biographer rightly, is only the champion of one class of facts, the positive and dogmatical denier of another equally ascertained class, which have even more to do with our condition as human beings.

In treating men as spiritual creatures, I am evidently plagiarising from the school of the anti-Secularists, —from those who say that religion is the basis of education. If I could understand that proposition to be a recognition of the principle which I believe is embodied in the old education of England, — if I could understand by it the proclamation of the further truth, that we are instruments in the hands of God for raising and educating the spirits of men, and that we ought all to confess this responsibility—I might hope to fraternise with this class. But it seems to me that too many of them, in their zeal against Secularists, actually assume their ground and relinquish their own; that they treat the subjects of their discipline as purely mechanical, while they affirm them to be spiritual; that they address them as if they belonged only to a mundane economy, while all their professions imply the existence of another; that they undermine the faith in a divine Teacher, even in the very words which they use to maintain the necessity of a divine Teaching. I differ with them, because they seem to me to differ with themselves. I only ask them and the Secularists to hold fast to the doctrines

from which they start, and to dismiss what is inconsistent with them; then I think they will, in due time, understand one another, and may together provide a solid education for the people of England.

Whilst, however, I have made frank acknowledgment of my thefts from these two opposing schools, I must disclaim all intention of fashioning out of these thefts an eclectical scheme of education which shall be half secular, half religious. Against this kind of compound I would most earnestly protest. I believe it must be powerless for good to any class, but utterly and demonstrably powerless for the working classes. There is a kind of Christianised teaching about philology, history, physiology, which seems to me most unchristian. It is offensive to the scientific man, because it twists facts to a moral; to the devout man, because it treats the laws of God's universe and His acts as less sacred than our inferences from them; to the working man, because he asks us to help him to see the truth of things, and he thinks we are plotting to deceive him. If you regard Christianity as something which is to be spread and sprinkled over the surface of things, to prevent truth from being dangerous—if you have not courage to look into the roots of knowledge and science, because you are sure that the God of truth and righteousness is there,—you had better leave the working man alone, unless you desire to make him a thousand times more of an infidel than you give him credit for being already.

I apprehend that if we are to give the working men an education, we must take them as we find them, not

as we would have them to be, in order to make our arrangements for them easier. But that is the condition under which all education,—that of the upper classes as well as of the lower,—that already existing in England as well as that which may be called into existence,—must henceforth proceed. The decision to which the House of Commons came last week, on Mr. Heywood's clause for the removal of the tests at matriculation in Oxford, marks a new era in the history of the Universities. The resolution may not be affirmed by the House of Lords; it may not at once be carried into execution; but there can be no doubt, I conceive, in any reasonable mind, that the rulers of the University must consider the principle as established, and must prepare themselves to act upon it. They must themselves be submitted now to a new and very stringent test. It is to be tried whether they can address themselves to the various sects of the nation, and, without exacting from them any preparatory agreement, can prove to them and to all that they are fit to be educators of a nation, the witnesses to it of the freedom and order which are intended for all its sons. I trust and hope that these ancient bodies will answer this call, as those who love them could wish them to answer it. I trust they will show that the senility which has been imputed to them, has been apparent only; or that, if there was any ground for the charge, it will disappear, now that they know how much the country demands of them. Which result I believe we may help to bring about, if we show that the maxims upon which they must conduct their education are precisely those

which we find applicable, and are ready to apply, in the case of men not within the circle of their influence.

On the whole, I think the reasons for discouragement which I brought before you in my last Lecture are fully balanced by the signs of hope which I have tried to speak of to-day. They may not be as brilliant as we should like them to be; they may be mixed with much out of which we could, if we liked, draw excuses for despondency. But if we have that faith in the power of good, and the strength that is given to weakness, without which any attempt to meet a great necessity must fail, I am sure that we shall see in every thought which every benevolent man has thrown out—in the triumph of at least one educational movement, and the feelings with which the people have welcomed it—in the ideas and attempts of the most warring parties—pledges of hope, that it would be sinful to reject or despise. I know there are some who cannot discover any such symptoms of good in the new palace of Art which has been opened to the inhabitants of this city. I agree with them that the salvation of a country is not to be looked for from such exhibitions. If I thought it was only to offer nourishment for our dilettantism, I should be disposed to use stronger language, and to repeat, in reference to the nineteenth century, what I ventured to say to you respecting Lorenzo's garden in the fifteenth. But this danger will be averted, if you use that which might be merely a place for gazing, as a place of education; if you do not contemplate the works of former days as objects of idolatry, but as indicating what men in different ages, who were of our flesh and blood, thought,

and in what forms they expressed their thought; if you connect them with thoughts and struggles that are in your own minds, and in the minds of the least instructed of your countrymen. You may make the works at Sydenham, lesson books for them in the history of the past. Out of those lesson books you may lead them to reflect: 'We too are men; we too have 'spirits within us. We need some higher Teacher 'than these, to give our spirits freedom; to bring our 'strange thoughts into order; to make us workers and 'learners for our children and for the time to come.'

LECTURE V.

THE STUDIES IN A WORKING COLLEGE.

I SAID in my last Lecture that the ends which we should propose to ourselves in the Education of working men, and of all men, were to give them Freedom and Order. Of course, I know how little worth there is in either of these words, so long as it is a mere word. Freedom and Order have become, may continue to be—symbols for stump orators and election placards. Either symbol may stand as a representative of most mischievous and hateful acts and principles. We all remember what Madame Roland said about the first as she went to execution; surely there are hundreds lying in Italian prisons who could utter a still deeper groan about the crimes that have been perpetrated in the other name. To speak of them in connexion with Education, I assume that they can be redeemed from the service of the platform and the hustings; that they can find a living, intelligible, practical signification; that they can be wrenched out of the hands of the anarchist and the despot, (perhaps it is a blunder to distinguish names which are always found at last to denote the same thing,) and can

be turned against them. If we have that purpose in view, the more habitually we remember it, the more plainly we avow it, the better it will be for us and for those whom we teach. I say for myself, that I do not care for Education in the least except so far as I believe it will contribute to these results.

I tried to show you that our Grammar-schools and Universities nominally aim at these objects, much more than at communicating any greater or less amount of teaching; that this is the justification we commonly put forth for them; that all true and effectual reformers have laboured to bring them back to this standard, to make them real instruments in emancipating the spirits of the students, and in giving them a sense of Order. We have stated the case to ourselves thus:—'These boys 'will hereafter have to toil in some profession or other, as 'statesmen, as soldiers, as sailors, as landlords, as culti-'vators of the land, as lawyers, as physicians, as divines. 'God forbid that they should not toil! God forbid 'that they should become idlers in the land! But they 'may become drudges instead of workers. They will, 'unless they are men as well as workers. Then their 'work will be free, brave, intelligent. The practice of 'their professions will be honourable, the science of 'them will be expanded. If they are swallowed up in 'their work,—if they think of themselves only as land-'lords, as soldiers, as sailors, as physicians,—the pro-'fession will sink into a craft; its mercenary ends will 'be chiefly regarded. It will lose its old dignity, it 'will conquer no new regions of thought and expe-'rience. Therefore, for the sake of Work, let us have

'an education which has not merely a reference to 'Work.'

We have been so vehement in these assertions, that we have even exaggerated the application of them, and so have weakened their effect. We have so much dreaded to make the Education of our Schools and Universities professional, that we have kept it at a wide, almost hopeless, distance from professional life. So those effects have followed which I spoke of in my first Lecture. The higher adult Education, that which our ancestors described by the word Faculties, that from which our Universities started, and which is their proper characteristic, has been buried under the mere school education. The teaching of boys has given the tone and form to the discipline which should direct the thoughts of men, when they are about to plunge into the business of the world. Hence that business has become, unhappily, divorced from the previous study. It is in danger of becoming a mere absorbing practice. The springs which should have fed it have been choked up or diverted elsewhere. I rejoice to think that we have suffered less from these causes than we might reasonably have expected. There is, I am sure, among the professional men of England a manliness and nobleness that are scarcely to be found anywhere. Every one of us must have had proofs in his intercourse with physicians of their freedom from sordid feelings—proofs to be recollected with silent gratitude and humiliation. Those who have conversed much with lawyers, will readily acknowledge that the generous and high-minded judge, who was as dear to the scholar as to the lawyer,

and whose dying words entitle him to the love of the working-people as much as of either, was not an exception in his order, but a specimen of what it may produce. And yet I gather from the lamentations I have heard among the members of these noble professions, how much they fear lest the science of medicine or of law, being separated from other sciences, and from the studies which belong to humanity, should be crushed under the details of business, lest their own lives should yield to the same oppression. I have no doubt that some of these evils are counteracted by that which they often find very inconvenient, the grumbling of patients and suitors, whose demands, often ignorant no doubt, but expressing real wants, force them to reflect upon their traditional habits and rules in connexion with the general interests of mankind, and with the principles of their science, from which any reformation that is not hasty and mischievous must begin. Still greater benefits may arise to these professions — and to another that is liable to more flagrant abuses and perversions from the idols of the cave and of the market place—if the Universities, stimulated by the Legislature, make a serious effort to revive their adult lore, so carrying into effect their own true faith that all particular branches of knowledge should be subject to a comprehensive human culture. But the greatest good of all to Law, Physic, and Divinity, may be expected, as I think, if lawyers, physicians, and divines, determine in their hearts that the hand workers shall not be mere drudges more than themselves, that they also shall be taught how to work as men, that they shall have such Freedom

and such an Order as no arrangements of society, without a spirit to direct them and the men who compose the society, can ever give.

When we had settled these to be ends of our teaching, we were less scandalised and discouraged than we should otherwise have been, by some discoveries which were made to us respecting the tastes and inclinations of the working people themselves. It was a curious, and at first a very startling fact, that they apparently preferred musical instruction to any other we could afford them. Almost any lessons would have seemed more practical, more suitable to their appointed tasks, than these. With the little time they have for acquiring information, how strange, how perplexing, that they should fix their affections upon a pursuit which, after considerable labour, could return them so little. But possibly their instinct is sounder than our criticism. They may have discovered the very truth which we have nearly forgotten; their welcoming of music may be a sign that they want something deeper and better than all mere indoctrination. The fact, it seemed to me, ought not to be overlooked. I was as much disposed to complain of it as any one could be: but it is of no use to complain of facts; we must adjust ourselves to them as we can. If we do not adjust ourselves to them, I believe our Education will not be worth having.

It would indeed be a very hasty inference from this observation, that music is the only study or the chief study which we are to offer our people facilities for learning. I have already told you that not a few of them, under every possible disadvantage, have devoted

themselves to Mathematics, and that the works they were engaged in have given them an interest in the study which they would not otherwise have had. Cases of their giving themselves to languages may be rarer, but unquestionably they are to be found. The authoress of 'Mary Barton,' the most satisfactory of all witnesses, testifies to the existence of learned botanists and entomologists among the Manchester spinners. How many of those who have devised our greatest engineering wonders have begun in the workshop, I believe we are scarcely aware. The profoundest scientific chemists have been servants in the laboratory. I believe the statistics of the most popular lecture rooms which the working people frequent, would show that history and poetry are subjects on which they especially like to hear discourses. I need not speak of the impulse to oratory, which exists certainly as much in them as in any class of the community. And no one can have listened to any of their speeches, without seeing how many ethical and metaphysical as well as political theories are seething in their brains. What, therefore, I gather from the willingness they have shown to receive musical instruction, is (1.) That all other instruction should speak to them as this does, less as distinguished by particular occupations, than as sharers of a common humanity, and as capable of entering into the feeling of it, in spite of their different pursuits, or by means of them. (2.) That it being regarded as the great end of studies to raise and cultivate that which is human, the arbitrary division of them into useful and entertaining should be discarded as illogical and embarrassing.

(3.) That they should have a considerable number of studies presented to them, out of which they may choose the one or two which have most attractions for them. (4.) That though they never should be invited to devote more time to any studies than is compatible with their ordinary occupations, they should be led to perceive that there is a relation between all studies; that the boundary lines between them are often artificial and imaginary; that when they are most real, and when it is most needful to distinguish between their objects and their spheres, they again blend together when they are contemplated in reference to our lives and duties.

I could not even venture to speak of a course of studies for a College of Working Men, without making these preliminary remarks. For you will be ready to exclaim—'Course of studies! what a wild dream is 'this! Here are ignorant, untrained men, with an hour 'or two which they can with great difficulty snatch out 'of a day of extreme toil, and you fancy that you can 'give them a regular systematic indoctrination in a 'dozen or fifteen subjects, to understand any one of 'which would require all the wits of ordinary people of 'our class, who have had a preparatory discipline of 'many years.' I am guilty of no such monstrous extravagances. I am going to speak of various branches of knowledge, between which I feel there is a close inward connexion. I wish the working man to understand that there is this connexion. But I would have him understand it, not by plunging into all these studies together, or even into one after another, but by learning under a teacher who feels the connexion himself; who

is in friendly and continual intercourse with other teachers, each trying to initiate his pupils into the subject with which he is most familiar. I allow for the short time, the very short time, which the working man is able to give to any subject. I do not anticipate the day, which, nevertheless, I trust our children will see, if we do not, when Mr. Wilson's principle will be carried out to its full extent, when the Factory shall become the College, when Working and Learning shall be regarded as inseparable. I take things as I find them. The hard won evening hours are all I ask for. I do not wish the married man—I do not expect the bachelor—to give up half or a third of these to the college. What I think he may do, if there is a subject which has already some hold upon him, or which he wishes for any reason to take hold of, is to come for the hour or hour and a half, when that subject is taught, week after week. He can, if he likes and if he lives, spread his lessons over a much wider tract of years than the ordinary student in a University; since he is not preparing for work, but in the midst of work. The Degree need not terminate his career, as it does that of the other; he may, therefore, make some amends for a little time at first, by the greater time afterwards. But he may make much better amends than this, if he is really awake and interested in that which he is about. He may speak of it at home with his wife and children; he may think of it, and even, as the mathematical students I alluded to are in the habit of doing, read about it, when his work is merely mechanical. And then when he feels that his mind is freer and more orderly for this part of learning,

and if he has seen something on the right or left of it which is needed to bring out the full sense of it, he may betake himself to that, or he may work with dogged pertinacity in his own original mine, till he has brought out some of its deeper and more hidden treasures. I have said thus much about the teachers, and the way in which I would have them think and work together, each keeping his own calling directly before him, each growing into a respect for his neighbour's calling and curing himself of his exclusiveness, because I could not well separate it from the topic which is before us now. But I reserve for my final Lecture the consideration of the class from which the teaching body should be taken, of the form which should be given to it, of the relation in which it should stand to the learners. My business now is to enumerate the subjects which I suppose we are warranted in offering to a body of working men, as being likely on one ground or another to engage their sympathies, and as fitted to elevate them individually and socially.

The first I shall speak of, is one which you might fancy I should keep to the last, as being very difficult and dangerous to handle, if I were not prudent enough to omit it altogether. There can be no doubt that the subject of Politics has an interest for a large body of English workmen which no other subject has. That is the reason why it is banished from many institutions which seek to do them good. 'We do not want,' it is said, 'questions 'which set men at war. Education is designed to 'make the mind calm and sober. Confine yourselves 'to physics; there is no excitement and passion. Once

'venture on the other ground, and you are in the midst 'of smoke; a smoke which betokens that there is fire if 'it has not yet burst out.'

There are some who feel the force of this remark, and yet who half suspect that you do not clear away the smoke or put out the fire, by pretending not to observe them. They think political instruction should be given, but under another name. 'Why may we not 'teach what is needful to be known of Politics in the 'form of History? We do in fact communicate much 'political information to school-boys when we read Livy 'or Tacitus with them. Working men who are likely 'to frequent a college will learn what they want or can 'receive respecting the present from the newspaper; our 'business is to give them tidings respecting the past, of 'which they have as yet only a very loose and incorrect 'impression.' I feel all the temptations to adopt this mode of escaping from the difficulty. I know what plausible and strong arguments there are for avoiding a name, which often alarms quiet people more than the most terrible things. But I am satisfied that these risks ought to be incurred, and that an Education such as I am proposing for men, will fail altogether of its object, if it does not teach Politics; if it does not give great prominence to them; if it attempts to disguise the purpose by any subterfuge whatever. Unquestionably I wish the working men to feel that they are studying Politics when they are studying History; I wish them to think of the past and to learn the lessons of the past. I rejoice to believe that our English boys are learning politics, and not merely Latin and Greek,

from Tacitus and Thucydides; they will learn still more of politics, I suspect, from the Bible, if they read it with open eyes. But I have to remark, once for all, that we never can teach men as we teach boys, let their previous deficiencies be what they may. You will all remember the passage in Guy Mannering, where Dominie Sampson, in his first rapture at receiving Mr. Henry Bertram, the pupil who had been lost at five years old and had come back at twenty-two, tells him how much his sister has been learning in the interval, and proposes to begin again with him from the first rudiments of grammar. Now there was nothing ridiculous in this proposition according to school notions. There was a reasonable presumption that Mr. Bertram, who had been roughing it in the world, was rather rusty in his accidence, if he had been lucky enough to have meddled with it at all, after he fell among the smugglers. Since sound knowledge requires a sound foundation, the Dominie had a fair excuse for suggesting that he should resume his studies where he had left them off. Why then did the clear worldly sense of Sir Walter Scott perceive something exquisitely humorous in this scheme of the tutor? why has he made his readers laugh at it more even than at his exorcism of Meg Merrilies? Because we feel instinctively that a man has rights, has a knowledge, has a position, which must be taken for granted, and respected; that he must under no circumstances be put on a first form, and turned into a child. You cannot do it; you have no business to attempt it. The world has been teaching him—I must add with all reverence, God has been teaching him—whatever you

have been doing. To overlook that fact, is simply to deprive yourself of the best opportunity of delivering him from the ignorance which cleaves to him.

I am not at all sure that we have not been too indifferent to the present, in our teaching of boys; that we have not far too much ignored the amount of incoherent information which they have received from conversation and newspapers, and have not failed to connect that with the work of the schoolroom. I find the most intelligent schoolmasters are beginning to adopt that opinion, and to alter their practice in conformity with it. And I think that by doing so, they will help to bring about one of the most desirable and necessary of all reforms.

It has become the fashion even at our public schools to give the pupils extracts from great authors, for the sake of the language, rather than the authors themselves. So they are driven to learn what is called their History from outlines and epitomes. The moment we begin to regard History as the interpretation of the present by the past, these must prove utterly unavailing; Livy and Xenophon must resume their place as teachers; Mr. Pinnock's Catechisms may be used to light our fires, since they have no light in themselves.

I think, then, that instead of binding ourselves by precedents drawn from the teaching of children, we may rather hope greatly to benefit that teaching by following out the method which is obviously the most suitable for men. To make our working people aware of the treasures which they possess in the history of the country, I would begin with the topics that are most

occupying us in this day. No doubt these are party topics,—that is to say, each party in the country has its own views upon them. You may make that an excuse for passing them by, and for talking upon some subject upon which all people agree, or seem to agree. You may say, 'There is a Tory tradition about this point, and 'a Whig tradition. I find these working people rather 'impatient of both, inclined to take up with some Radical 'opinion which they fancy is not traditional. It is much 'better to move the previous question, and discourse of 'air-pumps and gases.' What is the effect? The most active and energetic thoughts of the minds with which you have to deal, are those which you do not meet, which you leave to the sport of any chance influence. You say to the most vigorous man,—'Your vigour is in 'our way; we had rather you were stupid or asleep; 'and we will try to find some part of you which is not 'alive, that we may address ourselves to that.' It would be better to take any course, even what I should think the narrowest, than this. Give them your Tory traditions or your Whig traditions; enforce them by the most passionate declamation, by the most onesided exhibition of facts. Bring up your fierce Radicalism to confound both. In any of these ways you will do something; you will often irritate the man's faith, you will often outrage his conscience; perhaps you will find that you are not dealing very fairly with your own; but at least you will kindle some emotions, with which good will mix as well as evil. You will not leave the man to the thought which is the worst of all for him and for you, that there is nothing common between

him and you; that you do not care for the same things, that you are indifferent whether you are fellow-citizens, or deadly foes.

I believe, indeed, that there is a more excellent way than either—one which those who care to educate working men and to educate thinking men, more than to propagate their opinions, will find. I believe that they will be able to point out the great and precious principles which have been vindicated by the Tory traditions and by the Whig traditions; the grievous loss which it would have been if either had been wanting to the land; the great and noble spirit which has gone forth in support of both. I believe that in justifying these, and in showing how, while apparently counteracting each other, they have nobly worked together for building up the nation, you would be able to point out far more clearly what have been the sins into which each party has fallen, and what reason each has afforded for the bitter complaints against it. You would then be able to explain, while confessing the good of both, while proving that good to be necessary for our time as well as for any past time, that there is a good which neither could effect, nor both together, and which we may effect if we profit by the wisdom of both, while we refuse to be bound by the exclusiveness of either. Thus a teacher may give the most cordial welcome to the convictions and hopes which he will find stirring in the hearts of the working men, and yet may bring the experience of history to remove their prejudices and diminish their asperities. This cannot be, if we do not come to the task with a willingness to have our own

theories broken to pieces by facts; desirous to find men, better than we have supposed them to be; determined that what is right and true must be mightier and must show itself to be mightier than we and all other men are. This willingness, this determination, may grow weaker or firmer by practice. Nothing is so likely to weaken them as the habit of attacking others and apologising for ourselves. Nothing is so likely to strengthen them as the habit of bringing our thoughts into collision with those of men whom we wish to help, who will not take what we say for granted, who will often surprise us by their ignorance, often by showing us that they have got beyond our depth.

You may ask how I would begin with defining the subject which I propose should have such prominence; into how many portions I would divide it. I answer, I think if we begin with the topics to which we ordinarily give the name Political,—those topics that are most occupying our thoughts, foreign, domestic, economical, legal,—we shall arrive by degrees at the sense of the word; at the very sense of it which is indicated by its etymology; at the very sense which the greatest thinkers have seen in it, far more securely and satisfactorily than if we started with a formal definition, which would embarrass the student and separate the subject from his actual interests and sympathies. By the same method we shall get to perceive when Politics are dealing with human beings; when with the things which they work with or traffic with; when they are conversant about decrees; when with laws; when they are occupied with what is mutable, when with that which is

fixed and eternal,—far better than if we introduced divisions at the outset which are likely to tie it down by maxims of ours, sometimes confounding what should be distinguished, sometimes separating what should be united. By this experimental course, we do justice to the ignorance and the knowledge both of ourselves and our pupils, and we may make a particular study the means of illustrating and cultivating the method which belongs to all studies.

That is one excuse for the disproportionate length at which I have spoken of this subject. Another is, that I have included in it much that I have to say on some other subjects which would else require a careful treatment. I shall not need to explain how I suppose the History of England, or of any other country in the modern or old world, ought to be presented to a body of workers; I have already shown that I look upon them all as deriving their interest and significance from the light which they throw upon our own noisy age, from the power which they give of looking into the heart of questions which we are all inclined to contemplate chiefly from the outside. And do not suppose that I am showing our forefathers any disrespect, or am forgetting that they had a life and battle of their own, because I claim them first of all as commentators upon us. On the contrary, I am sure they will come forth as living figures out of the canvass—they will put on flesh and blood again, and be seen, not merely in the costume of their own time, but surrounded with all its circumstances and interests, the actors in a true human drama, when we connect them with what we see and do and feel.

Dr. Arnold, in an admirable passage of his Lectures, dwells upon the good which he had got from Mitford's 'Greece,' not because the sentiments of the historian were just, or his statements of facts always credible, but because he wrote in a passion, because he denounced Pericles with the same vehemence with which he would have denounced Mr. Fox. So Dr. Arnold learnt that Pericles was not less an actual person, not more a shadow, than Mr. Fox. He could judge afterwards for himself what place he occupied among men, whether it was that which Mitford had assigned him or quite a different one; but hereafter a place he must have, not in a mausoleum, but among thinkers and workers. One ought to be thankful for the existence of the historical partisan, if he only produces one such actual believer in history as Arnold was. But the experience, I suspect, is not an uncommon one. We have all had to bless some one or other for making us know that we are reading of men and women when we are reading bound books. I think it is also Dr. Arnold who says that he owed much to the 'Fortunes of Nigel' for making him recollect that King James talked broad Scotch. That is the kind of benefit which we have most of us derived from Sir Walter Scott. If we cannot always assure ourselves that his kings and queens, even that his ordinary ladies and gentlemen, had hearts beneath their robes, we have at least had one great difficulty removed. They did walk and talk; they had shoes and head-gear; they are not only to be found on coins. When we have got them so far brought into the region of humanity, Shakspeare will show

us what they were, as well as what they wore; we begin to recognise with awe and almost trembling that nothing has departed or can depart; that words once spoken, thoughts once thought, have a permanence which man did not give them, and cannot take away from them.

To receive this impression even imperfectly, is to learn history,—to convey it, is to teach history. Englishmen can, I think, learn it and teach it in no other way; no men are more likely both to learn it and teach it again to us in that way, than our working people. It is one of the great blessings I expect from a free intercourse with them, that we shall be compelled to study all that we might look at as antiquarians or dilettanti, heartily and humanly. No men have appreciated more, none perhaps so much, the services which Mr. Carlyle has rendered to history and biography, by giving substance and personality to names that had been mere watchwords of vague admiration or horror. Without his genius, we may, if we have battles to fight ourselves, understand a little how other men fought theirs; and the tougher and harder the fight is of the men whom we try to educate, the better they will enter into our meaning when we try to communicate it to them.

I need not speak of the value of places in giving an interest or reality to history, or of the rich store of topographical associations which the English workman, and especially the London workman, may possess, if there is any one to make him aware of his treasures. I can have no remark to make on that subject which has not been anticipated in Mr. Stanley's admirable

Lecture at Exeter Hall. But I would observe, in reference to the larger subject of geography, that I conceive all instruction upon it ought to start like our historical lessons from present topics and interests. If you begin with defining continents, and islands, and peninsulas, you will be falling into the Dominie Sampson method; if you take a map of the seat of the war, and comment upon it, the elements of the subject, which you may seem to have passed over, will gradually be acquired in the most satisfactory manner; and you may then go on to arrange and organize the knowledge you have communicated upon it as carefully as you will; the more order you can put into the student's mind the more grateful he will be to you.

In these last words I have indicated the rule which I should apply to all our studies, but which is specially important in reference to Ethics. What we want is not to put things into our pupils' minds, so much as to set in order what we find there, to untie knots, to disentangle complicated threads. I cannot conceive a stupider or a more useless task than that of prelecting to a set of tired artisans, about the benevolent theory and the selfish theory of morals, about the Platonical ideas, and the Aristotelian mean, and the Benthamite analysis of motives. But if there be in every artisan the seeds of all the theories of morals that have ever existed in the world; if you see these seeds bearing fruit in different parts of his practice; if he is the selfish man and the benevolent man, the idealist and the pursuer of compromises, the seeker of pleasure and the sufferer of pain a hundred times in the same week; then I know nothing more interesting, or

that may be more useful, than to follow out these different tracks to the point from which they arise and in which they terminate. The effort presumes some knowledge of what is going on in the minds of our pupils and in our own, together with a sense that it is very fragmentary, and needs to be increased by intercourse with them and with ourselves. It presumes also that we have sufficient faith in what we have hold of, to be willing that it should be subjected to all possible tests; and that we are quite certain that in no possible case shall we come at the discovery that wrong means right, and falsehood, truth. Like all efforts, it must be attended with much humiliation; but then what a reward! We shall feel, and we shall lead working men to feel, that there is a standing ground for their acts and their existence, a deeper and a firmer one than they or we had suspected. I can only repeat the hint about the text of our lessons, which I gave when I was speaking of Politics and History. It must be furnished by the topic in which we find that our pupils are taking the most direct interest, whatever that may be. We need care little what the occasion is, whether it seems an important or an insignificant one in our eyes. It cannot be insignificant if it is stirring the hearts of any number of people,—if it is deeply stirring the hearts of even the one or two we are conversing with. If they are attaching an extravagant consequence to some trivial point, we shall not make them think less of it, by treating them or it with scorn. We can only dispossess them of their exaggeration, by leading them from the paltry subject-matter to the principle which lies beneath it, and which really gives

them their interest in it. When they have come into the daylight of a principle, they will perceive the relative magnitude of different objects which were distorted by the twilight and the morning mist. Another hint, which may serve to connect this subject with the last, is that questions concerning our relations with society commonly take stronger hold of men in our day than questions concerning individual morality, and that we therefore have a better chance of coming to ethics through politics, than to politics through ethics. I do not say which is abstractedly the best method; I do not know. That which answers its purpose best in any given time is the best for that time.

I must repeat again, because I know how much reasonable ridicule we expose ourselves to if the remark is not recollected, that in speaking of these studies, I am trying to find different channels through which we may reach different minds. I take the most general subjects first, those which may have an interest for a great number, if we do not mar them by our way of handling them. But I do not assume that all will care for political teaching, or all for ethical, or the same for both. I wish to explain how, if they should take but one, they would unawares be introduced to some of the lore which strictly appertains to the other. Lessons on Morals, I think, will be good for nothing if they are not illustrated from Biography and History; nay, if biography and history do not supply the substance of them. So also historical lessons will, in my judgment, be far less useful than they might be, if they are separated from Poetry and Painting. I should expect the plays of Shakspeare and

the portraits in the National Gallery—supposing the College were in London—to supply continual suggestions to the Ethical lecturer. I should be surprised if he did not often take a play or a picture as the direct and formal subject of his lesson, and if he did not find that it served his end better than Paley or Stewart. It must be clearly understood that in doing so, he would not be poaching on the manor of a teacher who undertook to give lessons on Painting or Poetry. I think there should be such lessons; they would meet a number of feelings which would be less open to the Ethical instructor. If he was jealous, he would as often have to complain of intrusions from the artists as they from him. I do not speak, of course, of direct lessons in Drawing, which are invaluable and indispensable on other grounds, but of teachings upon the principles of the art, or upon the productions of its masters. I presume also whenever the musical doctor proceeds beyond the mere practice of his art, there must be allusions to the character that chords and sounds denote, which would be in the strictest sense Ethical.

The reasons which I gave for the wonderful popularity of Abelard's Lectures at Paris in the twelfth century, will be a sufficient defence for me, when I plead for offering instruction in Logic to our working classes. If I supposed I should be introducing them to a new subject, to one apart from all their previous thoughts and habits, I should be obliged, by the maxims which I have laid down, to reject it from our circle. But since the workers speak and think and reason, they are all logicians in embryo: what they want in this, as in

other cases, is to be taught what they are doing, to have their minds set in order about their own operations. I am far from sure that the person who undertook this task, knowing what it signified, and with a resolution to avoid pedantry, might not make his lessons popular as well as very profitable. I do not indeed anticipate a return of the middle age frenzy. I do not suppose that if Mr. Mill announced a lecture on Universals at Drury Lane Theatre or Exeter Hall, there would be an instant rush for front boxes, and that tickets would be unprocurable. But the working man who has been used to vagueness often manifests such a delight in discovering lines and distinctions which were always existing, and which he had not perceived, as the student, tired of these lines and distinctions, and longing to fill them up with actual forms, cannot appreciate. Everything shows what a blessing each may be to the other.

The study of language has been *the* study of our English schools,—it has given them their name. You will feel at once that it cannot be pursued in a working College under the same conditions which we find in them. Latin and Greek can never be the *groundwork* of a mechanic's education. The love of intellectual acquisition for its own sake exists only in a few—the passion for philology only in one here and there; these generally find means of gratifying it, and are transported from the working class into the scholar class. For such cases we do not wish to provide, if we could. But does it follow that the objects which our Grammar-schools propose to themselves in their culture, are not objects

which we should seek after, and which the working people themselves desire? The best good that any scholar gets from his Latin or Greek schooling is the reverence for words; a belief in their vitality and power; a capacity of tracing them from their roots through the different stages of their growth; a dread of the corruption which they contract both in the schools and the world; a lively pleasure in recovering them to their proper use, not only by observing that use in the best and most considerate writers, but also by listening to the speech of those who have retained some of their lost meanings in their provincialisms. All these benefits the scholar may owe to other tongues, but he turns them to the account of his own. He is not more fond of exotics, but more tenacious of the idioms, or at all events the principles, of his language, than other people. Why then can he not communicate what he has received, to those whose training must be chiefly in English? Why cannot he lead them to observe the etymologies, powers, and distinctions of the words which they are continually uttering; why may he not cultivate in them the respect for their own native speech, and the feeling of responsibility in the use of it, which he owes to his own discipline? I am far from thinking that some working men may not wish to learn another language besides their own—French, German, or Latin—and that they should not have facilities for doing so. But first of all, I would have special lessons upon words—the words which occur in the most familiar conversation, as well as on technical words; those which have the widest range and the greatest depth of signification How

much may be done in this way, is sufficiently proved by Mr. Trench's book on Words, which arose out of lectures delivered to the elder boys in a parish school. The interest which the lectures excited among them, and their popularity among all classes of readers, show clearly enough that there is a demand for this kind of instruction, which might be satisfied if scholars could only do themselves the highest of all services, by consenting to become as little children.

I shall have been greatly mistaken indeed, if I am supposed to undervalue physical studies because I have spoken at so much length of these human studies. Natural studies, it seems to me, have been unfairly treated in not being regarded as parts of a human discipline; as belonging, not to things only or chiefly, but to men. The highest of them all is surely that which we call, by way of eminence, Physiology; and this because it has a more direct relation to the human being than any other has. I believe there are the most obvious, practical reasons,—reasons which any benevolent man will at once recognise, why lessons on the human body should be given to working people, and should occupy a place above even those that touch most closely upon their occupations. This subject at once brings us into contact with the laws of health, with the conditions of the poor man's dwelling, therefore with all those common things of which I was speaking in the last lecture. The experiences of the working man,—his bitterest sufferings,—show him the need he has of this culture; the reward of receiving it would be an admiration of the curious and wonderful frame which has been given him,

and a higher sense of his own moral responsibility for the use of it. Such lessons would promote the objects which the Temperance Societies have at heart, better, perhaps, than any pledges. A knowledge of the mischief and curse of drunkenness may be useful; but surely it is better for a man to know that he may be, and that all classes will help him in being, something better than an animal. For sottishness will always exist where there is despair: you will never cure it except by kindling hope.

When I was speaking of Mechanics' Institutes, I dwelt upon the necessity of teaching the class for whom they were originally designed, the laws upon which their Machines have been constructed, and which they obey; that is a way to show that the worker obeys another kind of laws himself. One cannot carry out the principle of Dr. Birkbeck too far; our object should be to discover how we may make it more effectual; how we may give the mechanic a fuller and clearer impression of its truth and of its connexion with his own life. He will not lose the sense of that connexion at all, if, besides giving him the opportunity of studying practical mechanics, we offer him that instruction in the principles of mathematics, for which so many of his class have manifested a desire, and which they *have* obtained without our aid. From thence the way will be open to any even of the highest physical sciences, into which very few, perhaps, may seek a thorough initiation, but which should be within the reach of all.

I have often felt as if the phrases 'manly education' —'education for men'—which I have used so often in

these Lectures, must have an offensive sound, as if I were devising a teaching which should be confined to one sex. But I have adopted these phrases deliberately, being certain that by employing them, I am doing my best to vindicate a high education for women. Where the education of men is not manly—where it is effeminate—they will always be disposed to degrade their wives and sisters; they will always be suspicious of their rivalry. When it has been most masculine—as in Queen Elizabeth's days,—the culture of women has been free and noble in the same proportion. This remark is no less true of the working class, than of every other. I look forward to no result of a College with so much pleasure as to the improvement which I trust it will make in those evenings which the man spends, not there, but in his own dwelling. At the same time, I apprehend that much of the teaching I have described would be as applicable to women as to men. And I hopefully trust that if our present experiment should be at all successful, we may be able to adapt some modification of it very speedily to the use of females. There will be this great advantage in such a course, that we shall be able to claim the help of English ladies in following it out. Parts of it may, perhaps, be more advantageously managed by men. But the whole subject of domestic economy, many lessons respecting health, many respecting practical ethics, will not only come with greater force and influence from persons of their own sex, but would be, probably, full of follies and blunders, if they proceeded from ours.

I had hoped to say a few words on the subject of Amusements, which Mr. Dickens has lately obliged us all to think of; but I find that I must defer this till next week, or I shall not have time to tell you what I think about the teaching of Theology. Perhaps you will be of opinion that I have anticipated the greatest difficulty on this subject, when I alluded to the doctrines of the Secularists and the Anti-Secularists, and expressed my assent to the judgment of the first, that we may teach any study whatever without insisting that any other whatever shall be taught along with it; and my entire sympathy with the second, in their professed belief that man is a spiritual being, and that all education is good only so far as it proceeds upon that supposition. But that statement would not be a sufficient justification to me, for offering specific instruction in Theology, if I had not the same reason to give for that course, which I have given for teaching Politics and Logic. Unless I felt sure that the working men were divines in embryo as well as logicians in embryo,—in other words, that they must think about Divinity, whether we speak to them of it or not; unless I believed that their vague thoughts about it interfere with the feeling that they are men and have the rights of men—and that it is possible to give their thoughts harmony, and so to do more for the freedom and the order of their minds than by any other of our lessons; I should rather avoid a subject which no man of common sense or ordinary experience hopes to handle without giving offence. Having that conviction very strongly and deeply rooted in my mind, so strongly that it must.

have its expression in every lesson of mine on any subject, if it did not find this direct outlet, I think it would be dishonest to the working people if I did not give them notice of it, by using a word which is likely to frighten many of them. Of course no one need take more of our instruction than he likes; but he has a right to know what sort of people they are who offer it; he has cause to complain if they sail under false colours. If I asked any one to suppress his convictions, I should feel as if I were under a sort of obligation to stifle my own; but as I think all peril to truth as well as charity lies in evasions and concealments—and that there will be most safety, and most tenderness of others, when every one speaks out that which is deepest in him—I must exercise the privilege of which I count it a shame and a folly that we should deprive any. And as I make that our defence for giving a substantive place to Theology in our College course, so it is upon this principle that I should wish to see it taught. There are those who suppose that if we excite any one to tell that which makes him discontented with us and our conclusions, or what he takes to be our conclusions, we must be propagating doubts and divisions. I can only say that I have tried, and I believe it to be the best method of delivering our pupils and ourselves from doubts and divisions, of leading them and us to know where we are standing, and what we have to stand upon. If I believed that Truth belonged to us and that we could settle strifes, I should think and act otherwise. Believing that Truth is of God, and that our divisions come from our narrow and partial apprehensions of it,

I would ask Him to vindicate it, and to establish Unity in His own way. If I thought that we could give men Freedom or Order, I should leave the science of Theology alone; I should suppose that no such science existed. I would teach it, because I believe that God desires Freedom and Order for us, and will help us to desire them and claim them for ourselves.

LECTURE VI.

THE TEACHERS IN A WORKING COLLEGE.

THE subject which I am to consider this morning presents more difficulties than any upon which I have spoken to you yet. They are difficulties, which I believe can be overcome; otherwise I should not have begun this course of Lectures. But I have no wish to conceal from myself or from you, how serious they are. I am not to show, as I did in my first Lecture, that an Education for Adults is demanded by the present circumstances of England; that such an Education has existed among us from the earliest times; that out of it our schools for boys and girls have developed themselves. I am not to show, as I tried to do in my second, that an Education which is united with Work, is demanded by the present circumstances of England, and that such a combination is justified by a long array of unexceptionable precedents. I am not to show, as I did in my third, that the discouragements to this attempt which arise from our false notions of Labour and of Learning must be combatted, unless the freedom and civilization—even the commerce—of England, are to die; not, as I did in the fourth, that there are great encourage-

ments to set off against these discouragements, in the desire which the working people have manifested for certain kinds of Education, in fact, from their readiness to receive any Education which speaks to them as human beings, and awakens or satisfies the craving in them for freedom and order; not, as I did in my last Lecture, that it is possible to imagine a number of studies, each of which would have an attraction for some of their body,—each of which, even if taken by itself, would contribute to the objects which all Education is to aim at, and which have an affinity and inward relation to each other. But I am to consider whether it is possible to establish such an Education as this in England, and to find teachers who will carry it on.

Not for the sake of deferring this question, but in hopes of gaining some light upon it, I shall allude first to another question, which I passed over through want of time in my last Lecture. I dwelt, perhaps sufficiently, on the studies which should be comprised in a College course. I said nothing directly of the *Amusements* which some demand even more earnestly than studies for those who are engaged all day in hard work. The great general plea for amusements is the necessity which is felt for them, by the higher classes, whose ordinary toils are so much less severe. There is an additional argument for them derived from the reports which have reached us, especially in Mr. Mayhew's book on 'London Labour and the London Poor,' of the miserable recreations which our people have devised for themselves in default of the better which might have been offered to

them. In reference to the first subject—the great demand for amusement among those who seem as if they had no business besides that—one cannot help recollecting the remark of an eminent man, playing on what he supposed to be the derivation of the word, that 'no doubt 'it was very desirable for people to retire at times *from* 'the Muses, only he should like to know what time 'they spent *with* the Muses. If the string of the bow,' he added, 'was ever stretched, it would be more easy to 'determine when and how it should be relaxed.' I quote his remark not for the sake of enforcing it against a particular class, but rather of showing how it may be applied to a class for which it was not intended. The makers of coats and shoes are certainly not bound by their ordinary occupations to be *with* the Muses; the thought of their company, if they once entertained it, might, one would hope, be rather a relief than a burden. And it is not 'relaxation' that they or that any men chiefly crave for. There may be a state—I am told there is, of hopeless drawling effeminacy in some men, who have early exhausted all modes of pleasure, which pronounces all effort of any kind whatever, a bore. The cases are worthy to be noted; the Helots of luxury should be exhibited in their worst excesses, that young men may see and fear. But in general, people of all ages wish to be roused out of torpor. The stimulus may be of a kind which tends to produce great torpor afterwards; but the demand for it is a practical confession that torpor is wholly unsuited to our state, that it is quite intolerable. Do not suppose that men, who are working all day for their bread, are in this respect different from

their fellow-creatures. The gin palaces may lead at last to stupor and oblivion, but their first temptation is excitement. Every penny theatre promises the same reward; no ease for faculties that have been overstretched, but a temporary awakening to faculties that have been benumbed.

If this is so, then the desire for recreation among those who are hard-worked, does not make teaching hopeless, provided teaching takes a reasonable form, provided it is not an effort to cast new burdens upon a spirit already crushed and jaded, but an attempt to give that spirit exercise, that it may be more capable of sustaining the burden which it has already to bear. Then, again, if this is so, we shall not give any pedantic school restriction to the word 'teaching.' Whatever tends to make the man more human, is a part of education, not something beside it. Our ancestors certainly had this feeling. They supposed that the seats of learning were to raise the tone of the country in every respect; that whatever belonged to refinement and culture it was their business to diffuse. They did not perform their function very well. The entertainments one reads of, as given by them in the progresses of Queen Elizabeth and James I. must have become very formal and artificial. Milton speaks of those in his time, as simply ridiculous. 'There, while they 'acted,' he says, 'and over-acted, among other young 'scholars I was a spectator. They thought themselves 'gallant men, and I thought them fools. They made 'sport, and I laughed. They mispronounced, and I 'misliked. And to make up the Atticism, they were

'out, and I hissed.' But there was in these relics and corruptions of an old practice, the indication of what it had once meant. The University was to train the whole man, not merely one part or side of him; it was not to suffer any instruments which could serve for the elevation of the human soul, to become instruments in brutalizing it. There was the example in old Rome how the games and spectacles of a great people might call forth its worst and most savage tendencies, those that were making it the tyrant of the world which it was meant to civilize. There was the example of Catholic Spain, how all that was most dark and dangerous in the character of its inhabitants, all that mingled most readily with its superstitions and was stimulated by its gold, could receive a yet worse and more malignant character from its bull-fights. Did it not behove patriotic men to save their land from the like abominations, by showing that the eye and the ear are not to be left untrained, but are to be made subservient to right and honourable uses, not to those which are debasing and shameful? Alas! in this and in so many other cases, to some of which I have alluded before, the caste morality in the upper classes, and even in the seats of learning, drove out the higher, truer, national morality. The entertainments of the Court severed themselves from the entertainments of the people. The people were encouraged to be brutal; the refinements of the Court became effeminate and corrupt. The Puritan ministers, not without the greatest excuse, but wholly against the judgment of Milton, Colonel Hutchinson and their wisest men, strove to put down both. Both

reappeared after the Restoration, more debased, more inhuman, just in proportion as they more belonged to classes. The amusements of the lower orders, coarse and degrading as they were, were yet free from the systematic villany that was tolerated and admired on the stage, which received its tone and encouragement from the higher. Many attempts have been made at reformation since; some very unsuccessful, some not without a great promise of blessing. If we examine them carefully, I think we shall perceive that no good has come to the amusements of the higher class, except where they have sought to strengthen and refresh themselves by intercourse with the lower, to repair a jaded conventionalism by drawing new life from that which is essentially human; that no good has come to the entertainments of the lower classes, except from the same cause differently working, from their perceiving that they were interested in whatever has an interest for human beings.

The conclusion to which I come is this. The bodily energies being given to man by his Creator, and being liable to all abuse—the senses being given to man by his Creator, and being liable to all abuse—no education can be sound and true which makes light of either, which does not treat the development of them as a solemn duty, not merely as a bye work. The more we look upon man as a spiritual being, the more we regard education as intended to bring forth his spirit, the more we shall desire to train his animal nature and his senses, because they will certainly enslave his spirit, if they are not made its servants. This being the general

rule, its application will be different in different times, and places, and circumstances. It may be most desirable that there should be formal gymnastics in connexion with a London College, where the opportunities for exercise are rare, and the occupations often sedentary. For agricultural labourers, living in the open air, cricket and other games would, I should conceive, be immeasurably better. With respect to the other branch of cultivation, the concert would be desirable, and in general, under some form or other, attainable, in great towns;—some substitute for it would be found, I doubt not, in the country. The eye has a right to its own education, as well as the ear; how it should be conducted may depend on a number of circumstances, which it is impossible to enumerate or anticipate. Probably the discovery of what is really the most suitable method must be attained in all cases through a number of unsuccessful experiments. There is always a danger of assuming that what was good as an instrument of education in one age—what may be still very useful in another country—is necessarily good for our time and land; there is the equal danger of refusing to profit by the lessons of former times, and of surrounding nations. From the instance of Music to which I alluded in a former Lecture, we may judge how rash speculations are, respecting the capacities and dispositions of those whom we would train; how necessary it is to observe with care, what are the influences that affect them most powerfully. My own opinion would certainly be, that while no nation has more of the dramatic faculty than the English, or is more capable of

contemplating history as a great providential drama, there is less of what is histrionic in us than in the people of the continent; less that is likely to receive impressions from the acted play. On that ground, I should hope more from exhibitions like those which the Crystal Palace offers, than from any attempts to purify and restore entertainments which many of our countrymen look upon with utter aversion, because they connect them with a number of evil accidents, certainly not belonging to their essence. I am not, however, in the least sure that I am right; some facts would lead to quite a different inference. And I would say, once for all, that while in those questions which concern self-indulgence we owe the greatest respect and homage to the feelings of every honest man—while deference to them, when nothing but this is involved, will be always beneficial to our own characters;—all danger of giving offence ought to be risked the moment we are fully convinced, after careful deliberation, that the step we are taking will tend to give a more moral and humane tone to our fellow-citizens. That end is too important to be sacrificed to an object so paltry as that of keeping up a good reputation for ourselves, with any persons whatsoever. And so far from injuring their consciences, we may often do them much good by teaching them to distinguish between the self-seeking which they ought to condemn in the pursuit of pleasure, and in every pursuit, and those acts which, when they are not condemned by an express law, are good or evil, according to the purpose for which they are done, and the spirit in which they are done. This distinction is so precious

to the interests of the highest as well as of the vulgarest morality, and the pains which are taken to obliterate it, by some who venture to lay down laws for society, are so perilous to the faith and honesty of England, that we should make great efforts, and incur serious risks, for the sake of asserting it. In proportion as the upper classes feel the responsibility which is laid upon them, by all possible means to bring out in themselves and those from whom they are divided by circumstances, that which is common to both,—in that proportion will they be able to establish this distinction upon a true and safe ground.

This is the connecting link between the subject of amusements and the one which I announced for the present Lecture. The experiment of a Working College, which some of us wish to make in London, has been made already in Sheffield. The history of that experiment, as I have heard it, is very interesting. The necessity for it in that great manufacturing town was felt by various benevolent persons, as well as by many of the workers themselves. A scheme was devised, in which men of different opinions took part. It was found that they did not work well together. It was feared that the whole scheme must be abandoned. A dissenting minister of Sheffield undertook the conduct of it when its condition seemed to be desperate, and, as I have been informed, gave it its present shape, and for some time upheld it and directed it himself. When, after two or three years, he left the neighbourhood, the people who had been benefited by it resolved that it should not fall. They have supported it, and ad-

ministered it themselves. Last autumn so eminent a man as Dr. Lyon Playfair proclaimed it as one of the greatest movements in modern scientific education. Nearly all the London newspapers, I believe, commented on his words, and noticed the Sheffield institution as a striking phenomenon of this age.

Such, I am sure, we shall be right in considering it. Every step in the story is full of instruction and encouragement. The failure of the attempt to establish it by an appeal to the public, the energy of an individual man who had faith to believe that what was to be done could be done, whatever the public might say to it; above all, the proof which the Sheffield people have given that they care for education, and will have it, and can conduct it in an orderly, intelligent manner, increasing their numbers and their range of studies, as I hear they do, each year, is a fact to be dwelt upon with serious thankfulness. Whatever we can do, any of us, to strengthen the hands of those who have entered upon such a work, as well as to imitate them, we surely are bound to do. Our business is not to criticise their course of instruction. The suitableness of it for themselves, they are much better able to judge of than we are. All we can desire is, that they should work out their plan vigorously and thoroughly. So best they will find out if there are any defects in it which need to be repaired. What I feel about it is, that if we do not claim our share in the work which they have not of choice but of necessity, and apparently with the best possible feeling, taken upon themselves, we shall miss a great benefit which, for the sake of all classes,

we cannot afford to miss. I am glad that anywhere, in any town of England, manual workers should have shown the spirit which they have in Sheffield. But I do not think that we have a right to expect it of them generally. I do not think it is intended that we should be cheated of the fruits of the education which it has pleased God to bestow upon any of us, as I feel confident we shall be cheated of them, if we are not able in some way to distribute them. It may be determined, in the counsels of Providence, that the professional men of England, as well as the upper classes of England, should not have this honour. It may be that every good which the labourers get is to be won for themselves. If such a sentence has gone forth, I can only regard it as the most fearful hand-writing upon the wall:—'You are weighed in the 'balance, and found wanting. The kingdom which 'your cultivation would give you, so long as you 'used it as God's servants for the use of His children, is 'taken from you, because you have accounted it your 'own.' Some prophet's eye may even now discern those characters in the scroll which contains our country's destiny. But till they stand out clearly and legibly,—nay, even if they did—our business would be to seek by a timely repentance that the decree might be averted.

I believe that it is most desirable for the working classes that it should be averted. I think that we can give them a cultivation which they are not able to give themselves. For the sake of avoiding quarrels and discussions they will often be obliged to stint themselves

of a knowledge which, at all events, many of them want. If they seek that knowledge, it must come in a more irregular and exciting way, not as a part of education, but in the form of declamation and controversy. A knowledge so coming, will be partial class knowledge. It will not have the elevating, humanizing effect that it might have, if they felt clearly that it came from the pages of history, where there is no respect of persons, where each class is tried and judged and condemned by its own acts, because history is the voice of God, and utters in fragments and portions the sentence which He will at last pronounce fully for the universe.

I know well how hard it is, and must be, to persuade working men any where, especially those intelligent working men who are likely to desire instruction, that we do not mean to make our teaching subservient to our own purposes, that we do not wish to make the history of the past and the experience of the present, echo our own conclusions, and apologise for our own injustice. It is most hard to remove this suspicion; it ought to be most hard. We have played falsely with facts; we have bent and twisted evidence to the justification of our own school and party and class, and to the condemnation of every other. We must pay the penalty for these crimes. The expiation cannot be a very brief one. But it is possible to establish confidence, if we are willing to make efforts and sacrifices for it. It is possible to show that we love the truth more than our opinions and ourselves, if we do love it more. And there will be the rich reward of teaching others to love it more than themselves and their opinions, and so of making

them in very deed our fellow-citizens and fellow-workers.

We have got to this point then: I have claimed for those who call themselves the educated classes of England, at least the privilege and the right of helping the manual workers to educate themselves. But having defined our teachers so far, we are only at the beginning of our task. The Sheffield experience comes in to baffle us. The hopeless English public, with its infinite varieties of sect opinions, class opinions, individual opinions, what can we do with that? Sheffield says, 'Nothing.' Will London give a different answer? I should say, 'Beyond all doubt, it will give the same 'answer.'

I am far from saying that an appeal might not be made to the religious, or benevolent, or wealthy public, as it is called in advertisements, in favour of an Education for working men; that powerful statements might not be put forth about their ignorance and degradation, their addiction to evil books and instructors, and the necessity of a strong and combined effort on the part of those in superior situations, to extirpate their bad principles and give them better. I am far from saying that such an appeal might not be responded to; that Patrons, Vice-Presidents, and a Committee might not be organized, that subscription lists might not be opened at various bankers, and might not gain fresh names after each energetic harangue, or each report with the statistics, which some read and a few believe. But when all this has been done, what has been gained? I am afraid rather less than nothing. We have spread

the notion that we are raising a charitable fund, and these working people do not want our charity, and will not accept it. We have led them to think that we suspect them, and they will return the suspicion a hundred fold. We have talked of giving them our principles instead of theirs, and are we quite sure that we have made it clear by our acts that they would gain by the exchange? Then, supposing we could get our institution established, would it move? Would there not be continual assumptions, interferences, complaints, which make other works disagreeable, but Education, if they are allowed to influence it, impossible. Either the teacher must boldly proclaim the Busby principle, and keep his hat on his head when the many-headed king enters his schoolroom, in which case he will be pronounced a direct rebel, and probably be dismissed; or he must submit to a constraint which will destroy all harmony in his studies, and all respect in his scholars. By all means let our colleges and schools be open to the criticisms of the public, and let the conductors of them know how to make use of those criticisms. But let them be men who feel that they did not receive their commission and their power from the public; who understand that they can be of no use to it while they hold themselves bound by its edicts and maxims.

May we then hope that the Government of the country will, after due consideration, establish an Education for adult working men, and provide suitable teachers to carry it on? It would be easy to say many sharp things about the failures of successive Governments to establish any general Education for children, and thence to

argue how far they would be likely to enter into a new and more difficult line. But I do not impute these failures to the insincerity or the weakness of one set of ministers or another. I believe there has been a hearty desire in many, perhaps in all, to do whatever the country would let them do for its teaching, and a willingness to incur risks for the sake of ascertaining what it is possible to do.

I know that some consider the practical conclusion at which we have arrived, a lame and impotent one. It seems to them that a Government ought to go much further than merely to stimulate the efforts of different classes by the promise of assistance, and to prevent their efforts from being futile, by sending inspectors to see whether the work done corresponds to the professions of those who do it. They complain that the exceptions from this rule in the case of those who transgress the law, and, possibly, of paupers, give those an advantage who are the least entitled to one. All such observations have great plausibility; but, perhaps, the more we trace the history of English education during the last twenty years, the more we shall doubt whether they are solid. I do not mean merely, that such an examination may show us how very little right we have to charge Government with not undertaking a task, which our dissensions have hindered them from undertaking, but that Providence has shaped our ends better than we should have shaped them for ourselves, and that if we accept facts which we cannot alter, and seriously weigh the responsibilities which devolve upon ourselves in consequence of them, we may obtain an Education more suitable to

the English character, more helpful to Freedom and Order, than any which the best and most paternal Government in the world could bestow upon us. I admit the inference which the working people of the land draw, and must draw, when they see that wrong doers are cared for by the State while they appear to be overlooked. I believe the greatest obligation is laid upon us to take off the edge of that inference. We can take it off, if we show them that they may be all the more true and manly citizens of the State, because they are not harnessed and driven by it, as those must be who have forfeited their moral dignity, and as all are in despotic countries, where moral dignity is not thought of. If we are able to begin an adult Education, the Government, according to its own principle, will help us, and will see whether we are fulfilling our pretensions or belying them. To a College of the kind I am supposing, it may render especial service by means of those Schools of Design which it has already established. But if we wait for the Government to originate the College, or to conduct it, we may wait till the present generation has died out, and not secure any thing that will be worth leaving to its successor.

I alluded, in my first Lecture, to some earnest men who expected little from the public or from the State, in providing an Education for any class or any age, but who thought that our old cathedral establishments had been intended for the cultivation and elevation of our people generally, and that they might be restored to their original purpose. Whether the experience of fifteen years has chilled or encouraged these expectations,

I do not venture to pronounce 'Hope,' certainly, 'springs immortal in the human breast,' or, as another poet has it:—

> "Oh joy! that in our embers
> Is something that doth live,
> That yet we should remember
> What were so fugitive,"

as the good resolutions which some of these bodies seemed to form in the days when they were threatened with utter extinction. It never can have been wrong for any to have longed or laboured for the recovery of goodly buildings and great foundations to a patriotic use. But till the objects which were contemplated by the founders of our Cathedral schools are accomplished, nothing can be so absurd as to ask that they should promote objects which can never have been contemplated. If our Chapters will do their utmost to train boys, they may fairly decline to undertake the office of teaching men. Possibly they may do something many years hence to assist that work too; but it must be begun, I conceive, by other hands than theirs.

Can we look for those hands in our Universities? I own I expect great blessings to the working class from the new impulse, which I trust will be given to the education of the land generally, by the present University reform. I have already shown how much the principle of adult teaching is involved in that reform. The desire which all parties have shown, according to their different notions, to bring College teaching within the reach of poor men, is also a promising symptom, though unreasonable hopes may be raised upon it. The new position of Oxford with regard to Dissenters,

if somewhat embarrassing to itself, must oblige its rulers to consider more seriously than they have done, all the circumstances of the country which they are intended to illuminate. Supposing that Colleges were established in London, and Birmingham, and Manchester, the Universities would, I trust, entertain the question in a free and generous spirit, what degrees they might confer on those who deserved well in them; how, at least, they might remove all obstacles which fees put in the way of the very poorest man who should aspire to such distinctions. In Oxford and Cambridge they may do much to help the shopkeeper and the mechanic to obtain an education which they could scarcely gain elsewhere. I am told that there are ancient customs in the University of Oxford, which indicate an evident design to connect it with the trades of the town. The Vice-Chancellor, for instance, has from time immemorial given an annual dinner, or supper, to the hair-dressers of Oxford, they being regarded as a guild or corporation, with which the guild or corporation of learned men was to claim affinity, and to which it was to give a higher character. If these intentions could be carried out in their principle—not, of course, in their form—there might be a very honourable adjustment of the old quarrel of Town and Gown; the toga preserving rather more dignity than the fists and sticks of the Under-graduates can procure for it. But it is obvious that though the Universities may set an example, they can do very little to provide actual teaching for men whose work lies in the streets of the metropolis, ro the factories of the north. They may provide some

of the teachers; but the teachers must have left the schools and gone out into the world.

There are, however, institutions established in London, as well as in the provinces, which have a directly educational object. Some of these bodies are becoming strongly alive to the duties which they owe to the present time, and anxious to promote the well-being both of their own neighbourhoods and of the whole land. The Society of Arts, above all, is exerting itself, in its hundredth year, with quite juvenile freshness and alacrity. There seems to be as much wisdom as there is zeal, in those who are directing it. And that wisdom has led them, as it has led the Government, to feel that they can do much more good by uniting and animating bodies which already exist, and by supplying them with a machinery, than they could do if they set on foot an education of their own. They do not, therefore, satisfy the demand which I am now making, though they may render the greatest service to those, whoever they may be, who shall undertake to satisfy it.

It may occur to you that some one of the English sects, having the unity and organization which a common religious profession supplies, might be able to undertake this task better than a number of such sects, or than any body of larger extent and higher pretensions, without the same cohesion. I am not competent to express an opinion on this subject. If there is any body in the land possessing that kind of strength, and willing to exert it, for the sake of giving expansion, freedom, and order, to any portion of the working classes, nothing can be so desirable as that it should

make the attempt. Its success in carrying out such an object would be good for all; even its failure might be a blessing to itself. But those who are not members of such a society cannot feel that they are discharged from their own obligations by anything that it may do without them. All persons who feel the necessity of helping the great body of their countrymen, and how little they have effected for that object hitherto, must still ask themselves, What can *we* do? with whom can *we* cooperate?

I have known some thoughtful and earnest men, learned in the history, especially the ecclesiastical history, of past times, not less learned in the necessities and calamities of the present time, who have felt that a Sect can give little aid in our emergencies, but that an Order might give much. They feel how many of the educational movements, not only of the middle ages, but of later ages, have been owing to the devotion and concentration of purpose which were found in particular Orders: they do not see why the abuses which accompanied their growth, and the seeds of which, perhaps, existed at their birth, should be considered as inherent in their nature; why Protestantism, instead of repudiating the use of them, should not have power to purify the principle of them and convert them to the best ends. The subject is so important, and the persons who take this view of it are entitled to so much respect and deference, that I should be very sorry to treat either hastily. I will only state why I think this is not the remedy for the particular evil we are considering, whether it is applicable to other cases or not.

What we want to make working men feel, is that the daily ordinary business of life is compatible with—nay, is in strictest harmony with—the best and highest knowledge. They have been almost utterly separated in their minds, to a great extent they have been separated in ours; our business is, to reconcile them in both. This, I must repeat it again and again, is the only ground upon which a school or college, which deals with our English population as it is, can possibly rest. Now an Order proceeds upon a maxim the very opposite of this. It assumes that separation from the common work of life is the most advantageous and desirable condition for carrying on the peculiar work to which it dedicates itself. I know that there are great apparent exceptions to this rule. The Jesuit institution suggests the most remarkable. A man may be all the better fitted for a place in that Order, because he does not obviously belong to it, because he has the habits of a man of the world. But we all know that the compensation in this case is a more intense internal addiction to the interests of the Society, and to the words of the Superior, than would be called for, where the tie was a more acknowledged and palpable one. We may therefore assume generally, that an Order expressly for Education would consist of persons not Lawyers, not Physicians, not Tradesmen, but Teachers simply. That would be their duty; every other would be pursued in subordination to that,—would be considered as not the proper function of a member. Therefore they would not teach just what we want our pupils to learn; their acts, their very existence, would suggest

the thought which we wish, above all others, to dispel.

You will perceive that this objection is quite irrespective of any accidental defects or abuses in these Orders. It touches the root and primary intention of them. It does not prove that there are no possible cases in which they might be useful for us as well as for other nations; but it does show why they have been generally uncongenial to the English character, the strength of which lies in its reverence for common life, in its belief that all common acts and offices are sacred. It does show why Orders have been especially suspected by the founders and upholders of English Colleges, why Walter de Merton and William of Wykeham were almost as jealous of them, and as anxious to substitute another kind of life for theirs, as Cranmer or Thomas Cromwell could be. And it forces us to inquire, how a College in our days must be officered, if it is not to be constructed or organized by the Public, or the Government, or the University, or by any chartered Society or any voluntary Sect, or any new Order.

It may seem to some, that I have exhausted the possibilities of English life, when I have enumerated these sources from which an Education might come. But, in truth, I have only cleared the ground, that we may look at English life in its simplest, best known forms. In London, in any considerable provincial town, within a small circle of miles in every country district, you find men of various callings, with different degrees of mental power, with different measures of cultivation, all busy, each able to contribute something to the social improve-

ment of the rest, each tempted at times to be pedantical and over-professional, each tempted at times to be merely frivolous, each using a certain portion of his day, and desiring to use it, for the good of his less fortunate neighbours. Men of this kind are often thrown into sets, the physician, the lawyer, the clergyman, the artist, the mere man of letters, with many more—such as are described in all accounts of clubs, metropolitan or provincial—such as every one meets with who is conversant with the ordinary stuff of society, not with its rarities. Such men have been brought together by what in our thoughtless, indevout language we call accidents; they have, probably, many disagreements of opinion, latent or expressed; their connexions and social position may be exceedingly unlike. But they can work together, not, of course, without collisions and conflicts, but, on the whole, with more mutual confidence, with fewer formal explanations, with less of reserve and compromise, than people more artificially connected. Their association may not be firm; it may depend partly upon locality. But there are among them the materials for a real fellowship; limbs not ill-fitted to each other, if they were animated by the same spirit, if they were trying to lift the same weight.

A club and a college are very different things; they may be wide as the poles asunder. But a Club of ordinary Englishmen may become a College of intelligent, thoughtful men, provided a human purpose takes the place of a selfish one, provided they do not meet merely as quidnuncs and gossips, but as men who have tasks to perform in the world, who wish their tasks to be per-

formed intelligently, who are sure that they will not be, unless they are reminded continually of the principles which are involved in them, of the human beings for whose sake they are appointed. A Club—even a society too loose and fragmentary for that name—may become a College before it has found any pupils, or before it is certain whether any are to be found, because each member of it feels that he must learn in order to teach, that the knowledge he has in his own department needs to be compared with that of men who are engaged in other departments, and that he must discover what it is that combines them. But a man has not sufficient motive for this kind of work, not motive enough for testing the soundness of his own possessions, unless he has a certain set of persons present to his mind, who he hopes will some day or other be better for the thoughts which he and his friends are exchanging; they must look beyond their own circle, that they may work pleasantly and hopefully within it.

I may not succeed in making all persons understand what I mean; some, I know, will catch it very readily from their own experience. You may laugh at the notion of a regiment where there are only colonels and lieutenant-colonels, and no privates; but educational regiments must be formed by this process, or not at all. You must have the teachers first; they must feel that they have relations to each other, that they have a clear distinct work of their own; then they can invite scholars to join them, not as strangers, but as integral portions of their body. Such, if I do not mistake, is the principle of our old English Colleges, which I reverence as much

as those do who would set up the College idea to the exclusion and destruction of every other. It is unquestionably a great and blessed thing for any learner to feel that he is not merely to get a certain portion of information, but that he belongs to a body, that he is one of a learned commonwealth. This feeling is destroyed by some of the efforts which are made in this day to preserve it. If you treat the student as a child, who must be supposed to have thought of nothing, though he has thought of a hundred things,—who must be credited with an ignorance of all that people are disputing about, though he has heard every variety of opinion at his father's table, and in twenty other places, —he cannot have the sense of citizenship and of moral responsibility; he will know that you wish to keep him in leading-strings, and he will try to break them. On the other hand, there is no necessity that this feeling of unity between the student and his teacher should be confined to old societies with historical associations. It derives grandeur from them, no doubt; the impression of venerable quadrangles and oriel windows is not to be spoken of lightly. But the real sympathy must be in the persons, not in the buildings. With all their beauty and tenderness, they often strike very coldly upon the heart which has been used to friendly human countenances; they are not really loved, till they become connected with human beings that live inside of them. We may ask rough-handed men, who are already members of a factory, to become members of a College; and it is our fault if we do not make them understand that we mean a real fellowship of

mutual learning and teaching,—of actual joint workers,—though we have no beautiful outward symbols of our community to set before them. The words University and College point to a corporate life, not to a hard indoctrination. I doubt whether any teaching of our manual workers is possible, unless we can convert these words into realities.

It is a conviction of this kind which has led a few friends of mine to propose a College for Working Men in the northern part of London. They answer with tolerable exactness to the description I have given of the persons from whom it is reasonable to demand such an effort. They are all at work themselves, in occupations which they believe to be vocations, and which they do not hold it would be right to forsake under any plea of benevolence to their fellow-creatures. They do not, therefore, aim at forming a guild or order of Teachers. They are already admitted into their different guilds as members of the Inns of Court, or the Colleges of Surgeons or Physicians, as Artists, as Ministers of the Gospel, as Tradesmen, as Operatives. What they believe is best for themselves—best for the special fraternity to which they belong, in respect of the work which it is pledged to do, as well as of the science which it is pledged to advance—is that they should keep up an intercourse with men of different callings, and should do what in them lies, that those who are engaged merely in manual labour should feel that also to be a high calling. They may differ among themselves about some of the ways in which this end should be accomplished; they are

perfectly agreed that one of the ways, and the most effectual, is to strive, that the manual worker may have a share in all the best treasures with which God has been pleased to endow them. They do not think they have any business to consider how few of these treasures they may possess in comparison with many of their contemporaries; by all means, let those who have more give more; all they have to do is to ask how they make what they have most useful, and how they may increase it by communicating it. Their design is far from ambitious. It is not to found a College for the workers of England, or of London. It is simply to make an experiment, necessarily on a very small scale, in the neighbourhood which is nearest to the places in which most of them are busy during the day. If Working and Learning are to be combined, learning must come to the door of the workshop and factory, till the better day when it shall be allowed to enter into them. The north of London is not a region for great manufactories; but it is a region where there are handicraftsmen of all sorts and descriptions; it affords a fair enough opportunity for a trial though I am far from saying that in Birmingham or Manchester, or other parts of the Metropolis, it may not be made with greater advantages.

Indeed, it is this consideration which has induced me to speak on this topic at greater length, and with more gravity, than you may think at all justified by the very humble project which I have announced. It seemed to me that we could not shelter ourselves under the plea, that a particular effort of this kind is not worse than a number of efforts which are born in a night, and

die in a night; and which any persons are at liberty to make if they like to bear the punishment of disappointment and ridicule. Such pleas are not safe and good in any case. No doubt every man is to prepare himself, in whatever he undertakes, for the probability of disappointment and ridicule; that is part of his regular cost and outlay, which he is most improvident if he does not count beforehand, and consider whether there is anything to set off on the other side. But no men have a right to begin a work which they do not think has a principle in it that may live and bear fruit after they are dead and forgotten. It is quite possible—it is exceedingly likely—that our College may have few or no pupils in it, and that any kind friend who asks two years hence, with a suppressed smile, 'What have you done in that 'fine scheme of yours?' may have the satisfaction of hearing, 'It has come to nothing,' and of saying, 'Just 'as I prophesied it would.' But it is not likely—it is not possible—that the relations between working men and the other classes of the community should continue what they are now. If we were prophets, or sons of prophets, we might possibly have some answer to make to our friend, which would not be given with a smile, and would scarcely provoke one. As we are only plain men, unable to foresee results, we are the more bound to take care that we do nothing through our rashness which may make the feelings of the classes towards each other less friendly than they are already, may omit nothing which would contribute to unite them. For the upper classes to think they can only obtain what they consider indispensable to their comfort, at the price

of the ignorance and degradation of their fellow-men,—for the lower classes to think that the manufacturing industry of the country must perish before they can be what God created them to be,—is perilous to England. Any plans which tend to foster either of these opinions, must be mischievous; the most insignificant attempt to show that they are false; may be worth considering. If it has fallen into bad and foolish hands, let the good and wise take it out of them.

We propose to commence our undertaking next November. I do not mean that we shall form our College then—that is formed already. The Teachers are the members of a Society, into which any persons above sixteen years of age, who can read and write, and know the first four rules of arithmetic, are eligible to enter. We divide our College year into Terms; we even call our adoption of pupils into the College, Matriculation. These phrases indicate what we are aiming at. We wish to do what our fathers did when they provided Colleges for England, as it was in those days. I say for *England;* I will not make the antithesis sharper by saying *for the upper and middle classes.* For that was not their intention at all. They educated Englishmen, to whatever class they might belong. They matriculated them into societies regularly organized, that they might know they were connected with that which is permanent, not merely with that which is artificial and transitory; with what is human and divine, not merely with producing and exchanging. This testimony is more necessary for London in the nineteenth century, than for Oxford and Cambridge in the fourteenth,

If we can help to bear it, and so to associate together different periods in our country's history, as well as different portions of our population, we may endure a heavier penalty than that of being called pedantical.

The method of our teaching must, of course, be affected by the character of the different subjects; still the general principle of it has been agreed upon; I may say, it has in a measure been acted on. I alluded in my last Lecture to an experiment in Theological instruction which had satisfied me that the consideration of the most difficult questions was favourable to earnestness and reverence. With that experiment our College may be said to have originated. A Scripture class has been held on Sunday evenings. A book of the Bible is read through. The Teacher endeavours to unfold the sense of it passage by passage. It becomes the subject of conversation. The pupils state their perplexities with freedom. He points out what seems to him the solution of them. It would be ridiculous to say that this plan excludes Dogmatism. The Teacher, of course, expresses his own convictions. He does not dream of suppressing them because they may not be those of his auditors. But as he believes that his pupils cannot receive his meaning, however they might receive his words and repeat them, if they are merely dead listeners, he rejoices much when they prove to him practically, even by putting him to a severe probation, that they are not so. Though the same course cannot be followed in all cases, we have at least determined that we will be Tutors rather than Professors, that we will give Lessons not Lectures, and that one half of the lessons shall be cate-

chetical, and shall refer to the subject that had been treated of when the class last met. As we may not always be able to set our pupils tasks and exercises in the interval between the Lectures, this plan may in some degree supply the place of them, and may assist their memories.

I need not give you a list of the subjects we mean to introduce into our Course. I sketched a general outline of them in the last Lecture; a special programme will be published at the beginning of each term. Politics and Public Health will be the innovations. History and Geography will be made to illustrate each other. Shakspeare's plays will be preferred to Hume when we are illustrating the records of our own country; Drawing will be treated with the honour which belongs to it as a most living and practical discipline for the eye and the hand, the head and the heart. If we should not find that Vocal Music is already taught in our immediate neighbourhood, as well and cheaply as it can be taught, we shall claim for it a conspicuous place in our Course. We shall try to give the study of Words as much pre-eminence and dignity in this College as it has had in any, though we shall teach English words and English Grammar before we venture upon any modern or classical language. The teachers in the different branches of pure Mathematics, and of Natural Philosophy, will be in continual communication with each other. To secure a gradation of studies such as they could wish, will of course be difficult. Still we have proofs enough of the ardour of working people in these pursuits, to believe that it will not be impossible. Our teachers will endeavour as far as they can to avoid

technicalities and long words. But they will avoid just as earnestly a superficial and frivolous way of treating the great facts and laws of the universe, as if they were condescending to the capacities of men immeasurably below them, instead of labouring, with the consciousness of their own ignorance, to raise men a little more ignorant into some apprehension of the meaning of the world in which God has placed them, and of the relation in which they themselves stand to it.

As our great object is in all ways to show our respect for the working people, not to insult them, we have no notion of offering them this education gratuitously. They are to pay for it. The fees will be arranged according to the scale which is adopted in the principal Mechanics' Institutes of London. They will not cover the expenses of the College. We want a Library; and though the original teachers will receive nothing, they fully hope to raise up teachers among the working men themselves, who ought to be properly remunerated. This is one of the chief objects which they set before themselves, though they never desire to see the time arrive when the instructors shall be exclusively, or even chiefly, from this class. They hope and trust that professional men of all kinds, that men of letters, that students fresh from the Universities, that statesmen and divines, will always be found to take part in this education, will always feel that by doing so they are fulfilling their proper tasks, and educating themselves.

Because this is my conviction, I have ventured to speak of this Working College, to an audience of all classes except Working Men, gathered together in this

West-end of London. I thank you heartily for the patience with which you have listened to statements which often must have been dry, and to opinions from which many of you may have dissented. I believe you will be rewarded for that patience, and for greater efforts and sacrifices, if you should be led in any way to assist in this work, or in such a work as I have described to you. We are so convinced of the absolute necessity of not making our teaching dependent upon public patronage, that we shall not beg help from the public. The aid of those who are willing to trust us, we shall be thankful to receive, and we think that we can turn it to good account. Those who cannot trust us, I would beseech to commence a better enterprise themselves. We attach no worth to the particular plan which I have sketched out. It is the best we have been able to think of in the circumstances in which we find ourselves. Another may be far better in other circumstances. Ours may be modified, contracted, expanded to almost any extent. Only, let not any man be hindered from doing that which in him lies, by his suspicions of other men, — by fancying, rightly or wrongly, that what they do must be done feebly or ill. To every man, his country, his conscience, God himself, is saying, "Work thou while the day lasts, for the night is coming when no man can work."

NOTES.

NOTE I. P. 1.

THE 'Lectures on Education,' which are spoken of in the first Lecture of this Course, were published in the year 1839. They have been for some time out of print; and I do not imagine that a new edition of them is the least likely to be demanded. When they appeared, it seemed to me that two great perils were threatening education. One arose from the notion that the State could educate the nation by providing schoolrooms, establishing a system of instruction, inducing sects and parties to obey a common rule and suppress that which was peculiar to each. The other danger was, that the Ecclesiastical body in the country might, either on the strength of its ancient position, or of its divine pretensions, or of its command over a majority, assert the kind of power which the Jesuit body had asserted in former days and continues to assert in our own. That power, as I understand it, is a power to rule and govern minds, not to awaken and educate them. It is a power which the State has a right to dread. It has always interfered, and must always interfere, with the power of the magistrate, because it is itself magisterial. This, I maintained, was not because the Jesuit was too much of a Churchman, but too little,—because he abandoned the function of a Churchman, and became a mischievous Statesman. The true Churchman, it was contended, possessed a power of an entirely different kind, a power which cooperated with that of the Statesman, but did not cross it or interfere with it. It was a power over the spirits of men and of children, not to keep them down, but to give them freedom and expansion; it was an influence to raise men above the condition of animals, into the condition of moral and responsible beings. It was an influence to raise men out of a

warring, turbulent, atomic condition, into a social condition. It was an influence, therefore, favourable to science, adverse to superstition. It was an influence favourable to national freedom and order, adverse to all the influences, religious or secular, which threatened them. The State, it was affirmed, could not absorb this power into itself, could not dispense with it. The State had a right to claim that it should be exercised for the good of its subjects; had a right to interfere when those who wielded it were turning it to mischief. But the two powers existed distinctly, co-ordinately. No artificial arrangement had called forth either. No conventional alliance determined the conditions of their union. Their distinctness and their relation to each other, were implied in all the acts and thoughts of nations and of individuals. The course of history, not our theories and speculations, was to teach us how they were to work together or impede each other.

These Lectures were written to meet a particular set of circumstances which does not now exist. If I spoke my mind freely, I should say that the experience of the years which have passed since, has been more profitable,—at least in the question of education,—to English Statesmen than to English Churchmen; that the former have shown more humility, more willingness to learn the limits of their power from experience and fact, more disposition to use it within those limits, than the latter. This is an impression which has forced itself upon me very reluctantly, while I have been considering the acts of the Committee of Privy Council, and the debates which have taken place in the National Society. I do not say that we can be satisfied with either. I do not say that we could have dispensed with either; not even with the turbulent exhibitions which have caused most pain and scandal; nor yet with the third party of dissenting voluntaries. But, on the whole, one must acknowledge a more practical purpose, and a more energetic action, in those with whom one is inclined to have the least sympathy. One may dread some of their maxims and some of their proceedings; but it must be chiefly the fault of our own pride or ignorance if they do us harm. The Government now recognises whatever moral and spiritual power it finds at work in the country, and does not pretend to supersede it, or substitute its own for it. Every Clergyman, therefore, and every society of Churchmen is put upon a trial. If the Churchman knows what moral and spiritual

power is entrusted to him, he can put it forth. If he cares for a real authority rather than for the semblance of one; if he actually raises men's spirits instead of boasting of his divine commission to raise them; the State will ask him no questions, will commend what it sees he has effected, and will afford to him another kind of aid, which he can in general obtain from it at less sacrifice of dignity and duty than from the public.

For these reasons, many passages in my former Lectures, though I believe they were justified by the occasion which called them forth, now strike me as not only obsolete, but painful. There are hopes expressed, some of which have been disappointed, suspicions which have proved unreasonable. But it is pleasant to feel that there are more of the last than of the first. Some individual men, who were then exercising, as I thought, nobly, the true function of the Churchman, have since shown that their idea of it was derived from the school of Loyola, and have therefore felt, reasonably and consistently, that they could only find full scope for it by submitting to the Bishop of Rome. A Society which then seemed to be awakening into new and vigorous life, now appears likely to sink into premature decay and decomposition. But the training-schools in the neighbourhood of London and throughout England, are doing far more than they promised to do. Some of those who contributed most to their growth and efficiency, are not less zealous in the cause than they were at first, and have had years of sorrow and wisdom to give them a deeper understanding of their duties as English and Christian men. Some, we have a right to believe, who have passed out of the struggles and divisions of this world, are able, with clearer insight and higher powers, to work with their friends, their country, and the whole Church militant on earth.* On the whole, I believe that the last fifteen years, though they may have left us more deeply conscious than ever we were, of the wants of our population and of our own failures, have done more than almost any corresponding period in our annals, I might almost say than any half-century, to show us what cannot be done and what may be done by English Statesmen and Churchmen.

* One of the most devoted of them all, G. F. Mathison, Esq., died after these Lectures were delivered.

Note II. Page 13.

The passage in Guizot, which refers to the old schools of the empire, is in the 4th Leçon of the 'Histoire de la Civilisation en France,' vol. i. pp. 97—124.

Note III. Page 16.

The passages in Alcuin's Works, which illustrate his method of education, are to be found in vol. ii. part 2, pp. 265—354. Ed. fol. 1777. The notices of him in Guizot, are contained in the 22d Leçon, vol. ii. pp. 160—192.

The third Lecture in Sir James Stephen's Work, is on the character and influence of Charlemagne.

Note IV. Page 19.

'A certain Abbot,' writes Eadmer, 'who was esteemed very 'religious, would often converse with Anselm about the religion 'of the monastery generally, and especially about the boys that 'were brought up in the cloister. "What, I pray you, is to be 'done with them? They are perverse and incorrigible. Day and 'night we do not cease beating them, and yet they grow worse 'and worse." To whom Anselm with some astonishment, "You 'do not cease to beat them? And when they are grown up 'what kind of people are they?" "Stupid and bestial," was 'the answer. "What encouragement have you to waste this 'nourishment of yours," said Anselm, "when the result of it is, 'that out of men you fashion beasts?" "But what can we do?" 'asked the Abbot. "We control them in all possible ways that 'they may turn to good, and we do no good." "My dear Abbot, 'I beseech you," said Anselm; "if you were planting the seedling of 'a tree in your garden, and you were so to shut it up on all sides 'that it could not send out its branches in any direction, when after 'certain years you let it loose, what kind of tree do you think would 'come forth? I should fancy one with very curved and twisted

'branches. And whose fault would that be but yours who had 'confined it so immoderately? And this is what you are doing with 'your boys. They have been planted in the garden of the Church, 'that they may grow and bring forth fruit to God. But you bind 'them so fast with terrors, threats, and lashes, that they can enjoy 'no liberty whatsoever. Thus unwisely pressed down, they heap 'together evil thoughts within them, and cherish and feed upon them, 'thoughts that are twisted like thorns together, and so sustained 'by the nourishment which they receive from you, that they resist 'obstinately whatever might serve for their correction. Since they 'do not perceive in you anything of love, or gentleness, or benig-'nity towards them, neither have they any belief in any goodness 'in you, but they suppose that all your plans are so many con-'trivances against them, proceeding from envy and hatred. And 'this miserable result comes to pass, that as their bodies grow, so 'there grows in them hatred and the suspicion of every kind of evil; 'their minds become curved and stooping towards all vices. Since 'they have never been nourished in true charity, they cannot look 'at any one except with downcast brows and squinting eyes."'—*Eadmer's Life*, Book I. chap. iv. section 30. See also the following section.

NOTE V. Page 21.

The passages I have quoted from Abelard occur in the celebrated 'Historia Calamitatum.'—*Cousin's Edition of his Works*, vol. i. p. 3.

NOTE VI. Page 26.

The passages to which I have specially referred in the 'Report of the Oxford Commission,' are those which have reference to the Colleges generally, beginning at p. 129, and to the accounts of University, Balliol, Merton, New College, and Lincoln College, pp. 185—214.

My knowledge of William of Wykeham is entirely derived from this Report, and from Bishop Lowth's Life. There is a more recent work, entitled 'William of Wykeham and his Colleges,' by Mr. Mackenzie Walcott, London, Nutt, 1852, which contains much valuable and interesting information.

NOTE VII. Page 34.

My readers are no doubt sufficiently acquainted with Milton's 'Letter to Mr. Hartlib.' Locke's 'Thoughts concerning Education,' though they are often quoted, are not, I suspect, much read. The passage to which I have referred, in which it is recommended that the child's shoes should be so thin that they may leak, and let in water whenever he comes near it, occurs near the opening of the treatise, and is one of a series of physical instructions which precede those that bear upon moral and intellectual discipline. As I have quoted in my third Lecture a passage from Milton respecting Music, I will give the parallel one from Locke. After strongly recommending Dancing because 'it gives graceful motions all the life, and 'above all things manliness and a becoming confidence to young 'children,' he goes on to say, 'Music is thought to have some 'affinity with dancing, and a good hand upon some instruments is by 'many people mightily valued. But it wastes so much of a young 'man's time to gain but a moderate skill in it, and engages often in 'such odd company, that many think it much better spared. And 'I have amongst men of parts and business so seldom heard any one 'commended or esteemed for having an excellency in Music, that 'amongst all those things that ever come into the list of accomplish-'ments, I think I may give it the last place. Our short lives will 'not serve us for the attainment of all things, nor can our minds 'be always intent on something to be learnt.'—*Works*, vol. iii. p. 91, quarto, 1714.

NOTE VIII. Page 54.

The part of John of Salisbury's Polycraticus which relates to the trifles of the Schools, is in lib. vii. c. 12. De ineptiis nugatorum qui sapientiam verba putent.

NOTE IX. Page 57.

The extract from Mrs. Jameson is taken from the first volume of her 'Memoirs of the Early Italian Painters,' p. 30.

Note X. Page 81.

I trust that the papers which explain the origin, progress, and present working of the Vauxhall experiment are so widely known, that any quotations from them would be quite superfluous. A company for publishing illustrated books, in which the same enlightened maxims are recognised and the same practical plans for the Workmen are made legally binding on the shareholders, has, I understand, been recently established, and is under the direction of one of Mr. Wilson's family.

Note XI. Page 98.

The words which I have used at the close of the third Lecture will expose me to the severe censure of a class of men whom I personally respect, and who, on many occasions, have shown a practical interest in the education of the working classes. In common, I believe, with the rest of my clerical brethren, I have been favoured with an epistle addressed by the Quaker body to the religious people of England on the subject of the war. I am not the least entitled to represent the feelings of any one else; but for myself I do, with all gratitude, make answer to that document thus:—Because I accept the Bible as the law-book of individuals and of nations; because I believe the interests of humanity and godliness are superior to all other interests; because I hold that principle is never to be sacrificed to expediency, and that no plea of necessity can ever justify wrong-doing; therefore do I repudiate that union of Christian and Mammonite maxims which the advocates of peace have been establishing, to the great detriment of the education, morality, and well-being of the English people; therefore do I think a war in the support of right and justice has been an instrument in God's hands for breaking down that unnatural and accursed alliance, and for teaching us that we cannot bow at once to Him and to His enemy. Whenever the Society of Friends has testified by zeal and sacrifices for the good of men, even by acts which in themselves I disapprove, that there is a higher standard to which men may be conformed than the selfish standard, I believe they have been, in the true sense of the word, ministers of peace, helping to remove some of the diseases which cause wars, and of which wars are the medicine. Whenever they

have left on men's minds the fatal impression that mere physical life is the most sacred of all things; that money is the measure of worth; that the character of God is uncertain; that the principles of His old and of His new Covenant are contrary to each other; I hold them to be the ministers of war, the abettors of its worst evils, those who teach their countrymen to hail even its direst terrors as God's method of saving us from utter heartlessness and Atheism.

Note XII. Page 126.

I have spoken of the new obligations which devolve upon the University of Oxford, in consequence of the removal, now sanctioned by the Legislature, of the subscription to the Articles at Matriculation. As I have defended the principle upon which that subscription was originally established, maintaining it to be directly connected with Education, and not accidentally imposed as a test of Church membership, which it is not and never can be—I wish to explain myself somewhat more upon this point than I could do in Lectures referring to an altogether different subject. I am the more desirous to do so, because I believe there is a disposition in some of the Colleges to make use of the privilege, which at present they undoubtedly possess, of fixing restrictions for their own bodies by which the University as such cannot be bound. Such a course, however legally justifiable, is not one which I think can be safely adopted by societies desirous to do the work, which their founders intended them to do, which God and their country require of them in this day.

I take it for granted that those who would limit the Colleges to professed members of the Church of England, dislike strongly, if not equally, a purely secular education which shall avoid Theology—and therefore some of the deepest questions in humanity—altogether, and one which, professing to treat of Religion, strives to make it equally agreeable and palatable to all persons of all different opinions, with the limitation, possibly, that they must acknowledge a certain respect for Christianity. I heartily sympathise in their objection to both these experiments. Though I am quite content that both should be made, because I believe that it is only by trial we can ascertain how little either is compatible with the frankness and openness

which is demanded of the teacher, and with the cravings and necessities which exist in the mind of the pupil, I should mourn greatly if our old Colleges, constructed, as I believe they are, on an entirely opposite principle, and bound now more than ever to exhibit the power of that principle, should desert it for the sake of being thought comprehensive or called liberal. But it is a question which I would most seriously submit to them, whether they are not in that peril already, and whether they in the least escape from it by insisting that their classes shall consist only of those who were born within the pale of the national Church, or who have entered its pale. Is the teacher under no temptation to be silent altogether respecting Theology, or to pare down his statements and expressions upon it, so that he may adapt himself to the different habits and complexions of the parties or no-party which exist in our own communion? Suppose he does not take this course, but announces with great distinctness and vehemence his own conclusions, does not his conscience often hint the reproach to him, that he is more of a sectarian than a Churchman, or is exalting his own judgment above that of his predecessors or contemporaries? I do not say that there is no way of escaping from these self-accusations as well as from the evil of suppressing his convictions; I am sure that there is, and that an honest and humble man will, by some discipline, be enabled to find it; but I do say that it is not his circumstances which point him to it, and that if it pleases God to change those circumstances for others, these may have the effect of removing some of his confusions, not of increasing them. The more I have considered the events of our time as divine indexes to our conduct, the more it has seemed to me that we are driven from our old moorings, not into the open sea, but, if we will profit by it, to a more secure anchorage. We cannot test men any longer by their own professions, or by our judgments of them; we must ask the Bible to tell us how God regards them,—how they stand in His sight, without reference to their false impressions or ours. That is surely a more theological point of view than any other. It may be very hard to attain it, by reason of our own selfishness or opinionativeness; but it is just that which an English Churchman would wish to attain, if he could; it is just that which enables him to prove that his Church is not a sect—to use the language of his formularies, as if it were intended for human beings. Without binding any to

adopt these formularies, *he* may adopt them in his inmost heart,—*he* may carry out the lessons, which they have taught him, into his words and into his life. There is no need of concealment. The dissenters, who put their sons under his care, know what he is; they would wish him to be honest. They will probably expect him to be far more dogmatical and exclusive than they will find him to be; they will be surprised at discovering that that is not his temptation, that—because he is a Churchman, because he wishes to build up a united nation—sectarianism is a greater dread and abomination to him in himself than in any one else. I am sure that the writers in religious newspapers will say that this is nonsense; they are bound to do so; they would forget their function if they spoke otherwise. But I am not addressing myself to them, but to the Christian scholars and gentlemen who take part in the teaching of our English Colleges. I know that what I say will commend itself to something in their minds and hearts, in spite of any prejudices they may have against the utterer. When a man is confident that God is teaching these things to his generation, as He has taught them to himself; when he is satisfied that they are not the contradiction of that which our ancestors believed, but the adaptation of it to new conditions, he must be sure that those who need them will receive them in due time. Very encouraging proofs have already been given, that the best and most enlightened Colleges in Oxford, if they stumble for a moment through a natural desire to maintain their old maxims, will not be suffered to ruin their existence and their future usefulness, but will be taught, even by the rulers of the Church, that they can best maintain these ancient principles by frankly confessing their new duties.

Note XIII. Page 129.

It is probable that many of the remarks on the studies of a Working College, which occur in the Fifth Lecture, would have taken a somewhat different form, perhaps would have been altered even in substance, if they had been written after the work of our College commenced. I am very glad that they were not. Oftentimes experience shows our ideal to have been wrong. Then it is a privilege as well as a duty to correct it; for to correct is to ennoble it. Oftentimes experience shows that there are parts of it which

cannot be realized at once, which must be modified to suit persons, places, and times. To alter the design in conformity to *this* experience, is merely to save ourselves the humiliation which it brings with it, to reduce that which is higher and truer within the dimensions of our own pettiness, to deprive ourselves and others of a standard by which we may hope to be raised and reformed. I think most persons must have learnt that, if it is not an act merely of prudence but of duty to give up the most cherished projects and maxims for the sake of getting what you can at the first starting of an Institution—it is just as prudent, just as much a duty to keep your principles always before you. Occasions will speedily arise which will make you feel your need of them, and will force you to apply them more severely than you were at first able to do.

LECTURES

ON

THE RELIGION OF ROME,

AND ITS CONNEXION WITH THE HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN CIVILIZATION.

LECTURE I.

ROME IN ITS YOUTH.

MANY who are present to-night will remember a passage which occurs near the commencement of Dante's 'Inferno.' When the Poet first hears whither Virgil is about to conduct him, he expresses his wonder that so rare an honour should be conferred on so mean a person. He remembers indeed that there is a precedent. The hero of his great master's poem was permitted in his lifetime to visit the shades below. But it was not strange or unnatural that such a privilege should be bestowed upon Æneas, heathen though he was, 'Sith he'—so Cary renders the words,—

> 'Sith he of Rome, and of Rome's empire wide,
> In heaven's empyreal height was chosen sire,
> Both which, if truth be spoken, were ordain'd,
> And stablish'd for the holy place, where sits
> Who to great Peter's sacred seat succeeds."

This is certainly a singular motto to choose for a Course of Lectures to be delivered in the capital of Scotland. Your modern scholars have done as much as the scholars of any part of Europe to scatter the last lingering suspicion that Rome derived its origin from

a Trojan colony. Your older heroes have done at least as much as those of any nation, to show that what Dante regarded as the final glory of the great city, for which all its sufferings and victories had been preparing, was not a desirable consummation for it or for mankind. I certainly do not dissent from either of these conclusions. Nevertheless, I think there is a principle implied in the words of the poet, which is not seriously affected by his antiquarian ignorance, or by his ecclesiastical theory. That principle, as I understand it, applies to all nations which have risen from insignificance to greatness, and have maintained a memorable position in the annals of the world. It assumes that we may trace through all these, some great providential purpose, some leading character and tendency, signs of which will be apparent in the very opening of the history, and will be most conspicuous as we approach its catastrophe. The feeling of such a purpose imparts to many of the classical histories that dramatical unity, which we feel to be a compensation for their want of accurate criticism. A similar characteristic gives an interest to many of the historical works which have been recently produced in France, though one has often to lament in them rhetorical exaggerations, and to fear that facts and documents have been unconsciously coloured for the sake of effect. Something better than the Destiny which the ancient as well as the modern annalist recognises as presiding over the course of events,—a Will which is compatible with freedom, and which awakens it,—may one day, I trust, be fully confessed by those who write and those who read, and may compel them to dread every devia-

tion from truth as no less mischievous to the poetical consistency of their narrative, than to its moral significance. But such a belief will lead to a more careful observation of the course which every nation has pursued through the different stages of its infancy and youth and manhood, and to an assured conviction that, however the design for which it exists may have been perverted and concealed by its self-will, that design will not be sought in vain by the faithful student, and may be fulfilled, within his own sphere, by the faithful citizen.

While, however, I look upon this doctrine as one of the widest application, as one which may be safely tested by the annals of England or Scotland or France, I cannot help perceiving the most striking illustration of it in the case to which Dante referred. The traditions respecting Æneas contain, it seems to me, the germ of an idea that has been worked out in the records of the Popedom. The life and empire of Rome, in all its intermediate periods, exhibits, I think, the development and fructification of this seed, so that we cannot understand the good or the evil which we find at one or another moment in those memorable records, if we refuse to take notice of it. I do not conceive that any change which has taken place in our views respecting Roman history, any discovery that we had mistaken legends for facts, has robbed us of materials for this investigation, or can affect the method of it. Every new light which has been thrown upon the character or constitution of the people, ought to be, and I believe will prove to be, also a light to us in this path. Every hint that has been given respecting the value of heroical lays or my-

thological traditions, is of the greatest value to him who is endeavouring to look upon the story as a whole, not merely as a collection of fragments. At the same time there will be, I suspect, a great satisfaction in finding that the interest which our fathers took in Roman history—the influence which it exercised upon their characters and their lives—was not derived from a spurious source, was not the consequence of their mistakes or their credulity, but was the fruit of a genuine instinct which led them to perceive a truth and a sequence in the narrative, that no increased knowledge respecting its details can excuse the men of this day for forgetting.

This last consideration will, I hope, acquit me of the extreme presumption which may at first seem to be involved in the task I have undertaken. I shall have need enough of your indulgence, while I am skimming hastily over a ground with the steps of which many of you will be familiar, about the objects and views in which many of you will have forgotten more than I have ever learnt. But if you fancy that it is necessary for my purpose that I should lead you, or should be capable of leading you, into any profound historical or philological inquiries, you are mistaken. I rejoice to think, as I have said already, that no remarks which I shall make can diminish your interest in those inquiries. But my proper business will be with commonplaces which the most superficial readers are acquainted with. I would wish you to consider what is implied in facts which are so well known to us that we scarcely suppose anything is implied in them, in traditions which we fancy are parts of a school-boy lore that men have left a long way

behind them. I believe the benefit, in a refined and cultivated society, in an advanced period of civilization, of recurring to these old thoughts, of questioning them and dwelling upon them, is more than we are any of us aware of. Distant periods of our own lives are brought together. The fresh life of the boy is strengthened with the experience of the man, and imparts more than it receives. The periods of the world's life are in like manner brought nearer to each other, and we understand how identical the laws which govern the progress and changes of the species are with those which we trace in the individual.

But there are some reasons which incline me to think that such studies, especially when they relate to Roman history and to Roman faith, are peculiarly demanded in our day. Every one must be aware in himself of a certain vagueness and perplexity when he contemplates the influence of Rome on the destinies of mankind. What is this gigantic fatal power, so unlike that which we observe in the empires of the East,—not denoted by a few sweeping conquests,—not raising huge walls and palaces and temples, that vanish out of sight and after a number of ages give back a few scattered memorials of themselves to new races which have forgotten them,—but which rises quietly and majestically, winning miraculous victories by steady foresight and intelligible means; amidst all changes of time and circumstance preserving not merely an identity of name, but of essence; never perishing in one form till it has left an heir of its greatness; in its ruins discovering that skill and energy which the nations of the western world

confess to have been at work in the formation of their own habits and institutions? The transitory rule of some dynasty, or of some nation that has trampled others down, we can describe as a necessary visitation, as a scourge for the cure of internal evils. But so permanent a dominion as this, adapting itself to such a variety of conditions, and preserving so strange a uniformity, what does it denote? At one moment we are ready to hail it as a great instrument of civilization; there has been surely a beneficent design in all its growth and continuance. Then our thoughts are recalled to the portentous crimes that marked the acquisition of this power, and the exercise of it; crimes which we can limit to no period, of which the Republic furnished examples as startling as the Empire; and which we want no other testimonies than those of the historians, poets, divines, of the Middle Ages, to prove were not less when the city of the Cæsars had been changed into the spiritual capital of Christendom. Must we accept the most horrible of all conclusions,—that the course of the world has been under the dominion of some dæmon, by whom occasional good is permitted, only to make the evil system he has ordained more conspicuous and more inevitable?

I think the conscience of mankind could better ward off this frightful hypothesis, if another thought still more perplexing, or rather a legion of thoughts with a specially tremendous one at their head, did not come in to strengthen the worse reason and make it appear the better. There can be no doubt that the religion of old Rome was bound up with its very life, impregnated all

its institutions, was a principal cause of its consistency and of its endurance. This fact is obvious to the most careless thinker; the most accomplished students say that it seems more important to them the further they have pursued their researches. But was not this religion in its essence false and evil? Must not any polity which was derived from it, have been necessarily like its parent? Must not all greatness which it sustained have been accursed and destructive? These are startling and agitating questions. Intelligent men, sincere students of history, have sometimes made them more painful still by the answers which they have given to them. One will tell us, that Romans did noble deeds, and exhibited a noble character, so long as they believed that which was utterly fictitious; but that the moment they saw things as they were, and therefore understood their faith to be folly, they became heartless and base, eager to be tyrants, ready to be slaves. A statement of a precisely opposite character to this sounds at first even more astonishing and alarming, both from its own nature, and from the character and authority of the speaker. Niebuhr, in a letter written to Savigny from Rome, in 1818, after lamenting the falsehood and the infidelity of the people whom he saw about him, observes, 'All this seems the strangest thing to me, when 'one looks back to the old Romans, who were governed 'by a religion of the strictest veracity, fidelity, and 'honesty. If it should ever be in my power to continue 'my history, I shall venture to demonstrate how this 'religion, which was something quite different from 'Stoicism, was the foundation on which the greatness of

'the old republican time was reared, and how the whole 'life of the constitution depended on it.'

So remarkable an utterance as this, may well make us pause. There are parts of the religion of the old Romans, not when corrupted, but, so far as we can tell, as it existed from the first, which no authority in the world, not even Niebuhr's, can force us to think either veracious or honest. Nevertheless, a man so truthful in his own character, and so impatient of the absence of truth either in criticism or in life, writing with an unparalleled knowledge of the subject, to a man better able than almost any to judge of the soundness of his opinion, would scarcely have ventured such a statement as this without having some grounds for it which deserve the most earnest attention. One is not bound to make him an offender for a word. The familiarity of a letter, and the capacity of his correspondent, are an excuse for ellipses which in a book addressed to the public he would have been bound to fill up. Still, unless we inquire carefully what the veracious and honest element of the religion was to which he attributes such great effects, we shall certainly be likely to gather from his dictum an excuse for that which he would have most abhorred—for insincerity or for want of faith.

I think I shall be treating this subject most fairly, if I do not begin from the Religion or Mythology of the Romans, but rather from some part of their habits and political constitution, which we confess, with little dissension, to be characteristic and national. I shall not stop to prove that one of these is the power which the Roman father exercised over his child. This power is

connected with all the stories which have made the deepest impression upon our childhood, with those which we wondered and trembled at; which assured us that we were reading of an orderly, and therefore a most mighty race. The questions which these stories excited in us were not always pleasant. Were the actors in them to be reverenced or hated? were they entirely right, or utterly wrong? But they did not suggest the least thought of cruelty; rather of fixed purpose, controlling affections that certainly existed, that were, perhaps, unusually strong. These childish feelings, instead of being corrected by subsequent study, are always gaining strength. When we begin to hear a little of Roman law, maxims respecting the power of the father, titles and institutions grounded upon it, meet us at every turn. We have struck against a gnarled and fibrous root, which is spreading itself out in all directions. Natural Fatherhood suggests the thought of Adoption. It seems as if the relation had a power of multiplying itself indefinitely. Then come in the different forms of emancipation. The whole doctrine of citizenship, when it is latent, when it is complete and acknowledged, is involved with these paternal rights.

These are loose hasty observations which every one makes. We are suspicious of them, because they are so obvious. If we could sit at the feet of some great jurist, he would, perhaps, explain to us that all these are but the accidents and circumstances of the history; that there are certain deeper principles in the constitution to which they may be referred. M. Savigny, Niebuhr's correspondent, is as high an authority as we

can appeal to upon the subject. No one has more extensive knowledge of it in all its bearings; he approaches it with the earnestness of a citizen, and with the impartiality of a scholar. The object he proposes to himself necessarily leads him to view the history from its legal side; he will therefore warn us of any fancies we may fall into, that there is something older and deeper than Law. Such would be his inclination. But the fact is, that this authority of the Father seems to him so original, so fundamental, a fact of Roman existence, that he departs from his proper functions for the sake of doing homage to it. Strictly speaking, a jurist would treat all branches of law as comprehended under Obligations; he would not admit any thing to be within his province which could not, in some manner, be referred to that head. But M. Savigny says in terms that the Roman jurist cannot adhere to this rule. He must recognise the Family principle as antecedent to all formal obligations, as implied in them. He cannot advance a step, if he is not willing to make this sacrifice of systematic consistency to undoubted fact.

The first impression which this power made was, I said, somewhat confused; the second may be positively painful. The dominion of the Father over the life of his son, together with the fact that the son for many years was under conditions similar to those of the slave, suggests the thought that the whole scheme of existence was a vast tyranny, out of which individual existence and responsibility can only by slow degrees have emerged. Such representations have been made by eminent moralists and commentators on history. The

slave, it has been said, was one of his master's possessions; the son was scarcely distinguishable from him. The Family consisted of both. Does not this prove that in our sense of the word the Family had no existence; that the head was an owner or proprietor merely; that Law and Government, if indeed they shaped themselves in conformity with this idea, must have overlooked Persons altogether, must have contemplated only those rights which have reference to Things?

There is great plausibility in this statement. There is so far a truth in it, that Rome had certainly from the first the capacity of becoming a state in which the life of the citizen, the life of the man, was unrecognised, was impossible. That a time arrived when this capacity was turned into full and frightful reality, all admit; that is what we mean when we speak of imperial despotism; it is of this that we trace the workings in the decline and fall of Roman greatness. It is right and important that the historian should not ascribe these to accidents occurring at a particular period, or to some external impact; that he should seek for the seeds of them in the earliest periods. But what was it that the despotism subverted? what was it that declined and fell? We want an answer to this question. A true consideration of the Roman doctrine and practice respecting the parental and filial relation, I think, leads to the most satisfactory answer we can obtain. This doctrine and practice were not *grounded* upon the confusion of things with persons, of human beings with property. They were *the* great protests in the ancient Pagan world against that confusion; the great indication and assertion

of the eternal Law, which that confusion disturbs and violates. The mere title of a man to certain material possessions could never become the first subject of a law which derived its form and its life from the authority of the parent; so long as that authority continued to be the fundamental article of the popular belief, the tendency to look at possession as the capital distinction and characteristic of a human being always encountered the most vigorous and practical counteraction. Nay more; there was involved in that idea of the Family, as containing within it both the Son and the slave, not the degradation of the first, but the elevation of the second; not the reducing of the heir into a chattel, but the acknowledgment of the captive in war, the purchasable article, as having the capacities of a citizen and a human being. If the Son must be emancipated at a certain stage of his life, that he might exercise the powers and fulfil the duties which were always latent in him, which his name and position implied,—the slave might share a similar emancipation; there was nothing in his nature or temporary position, to hinder him from eventually wielding the same powers, fulfilling the same duties.

Thus there was in the heart of this commonwealth, embedded in its jurisprudence, worked into the very habits of its citizens, a principle which asserted the highest Government to be connected with a human relationship, to be derived out of it. Power was not controlled by certain artificial checks, by the assertion of certain rights in the subjects of it; not even by an occasional play of the affections. The sternest, strongest power was that which was found established among

men by the conditions of their birth; that power compelled him who exercised it, to regard the subject of it as having a nature like his own. It involved that reverence for persons, that tacit acknowledgment of personality when it was unable to assert itself, when other motives urged to the utter denial of it, in which we may trace the germ of all later experiments to vindicate for the serf, moral, social, human rights.

I am especially anxious that you should perceive that I am not selecting a particular title of Roman law, or a particular experience of Roman life, because it is one for which I may have conceived some private sympathy; but that I am at least trying to discover the most radical, permanent principle of the greatness of the state, and of its citizens. I do not suppose that when it is fully stated, any one will differ widely with me in my opinion. But we need to state it, and to connect it with a number of facts and traditions which are floating in our minds, in order that we may appreciate it; and, above all, that we may see how it bears upon the proper subject of this Lecture. We are liable to adopt two opinions, each of which will, I think, lead us astray. One is, that the Roman feeling, as I have described it, because it touches so closely upon common human feelings, is not distinctive of the nation; the other is, that it may be sufficiently accounted for, and that it was merely kept alive, by certain accidental circumstances, and by the force of laws and institutions. I will touch upon both these points before I proceed further.

We cannot better understand in what sense the acknowledgment of fatherly power and the incidents that arose

out of it, belonged to Rome, than by comparing its state for a moment with that of the Oriental monarchies and of the Grecian republics. No doubt a patriarchal principle was latent in all the despotisms of the East: it is to them that the modern admirers of what they call patriarchal governments turn, with a scarcely dissembled affection. Whatever occasional abuses they may discover in the administration of the power, the maxim on which it proceeded was, they affirm, more favourable than any other to human happiness. I do not mean to argue the point. What I wish is, to ascertain wherein *this* patriarchal principle differs from the one which we find penetrating the Latin life and character. In the passage to which I referred just now, Savigny says, in answering a charge of Hegel and of Adam Müller, that naked despotism was implied in the fatherly authority: 'These writers have not taken this point 'into account, that among no people of the old world 'were wives so highly honoured as in Rome.' And he quotes from Columella what he calls—and I think we shall none of us disagree with him—this beautiful description of the family life of the older times: 'There 'was then the highest reverence, joined with concord 'and with industry; there was no division of interests 'to be seen in the house; nothing which the husband or 'the wife claimed to belong to either of their own right: 'all was looked upon as common to both.'

Compare a state of things where even the conception of such a life as this was possible, let the realization of it have been as imperfect as it might, with that which must exist wherever polygamy prevails, wherever the

monarch, the father of the people, claims specially in virtue of his dignity to be surrounded with a seraglio; and then estimate, if you can, how these ideas must have affected all the parts of a society in which they respectively prevailed; how the spirit of relationship, of a community of interests united with a distinctness of persons, must have diffused itself through all the orders and institutions of the one state; how entirely the monarch himself must have been the embodiment of the principle of fatherhood and government in the other case, whilst all occupations and duties will have been merely services prescribed by the one central authority, and rendered to it. Or have I not unawares, and almost of necessity, fallen into a wrong mode of speaking? Ought I not rather to have said that the very idea of orders and institutions belongs to the one principle and has been developed out of it, and that if the eastern maxim is at the foundation of the society, and not merely, as it was in the case of the Jews, a temporary accident and outgrowth, there can be no orders or institutions at all? Despotism, in that sense in which it soon becomes identical with mere dominion over things, in which every minister of the State is only an agent to extract certain revenues from other less responsible agents, is ultimately its only possible condition.

The point to which I have drawn your attention in this comparison is this,—that the patriarchal character in the case of the eastern monarch attaches to him as a monarch,—that he is the king first, then the father; whereas the idea of fatherhood was the primary one in the Italian people, and might or might not connect

itself with the person of any sovereign. This remark bears especially upon the early period of the Roman State; upon that kingly period, many of the traditions of which we have ceased to believe, but the existence of which is not disputed. It was most natural that the fatherly authority should be first exhibited in actual rulers, and that when any one of these clearly proved that he was not a father, but a tyrant, the principle should have had strength to break loose from its temporary representative, to manifest itself through old forms and names which had become sacred, to discover new ways of securing reverence and obedience. Scipio, in Cicero's 'Dialogue on the Republic,' to which I may refer for another purpose in a future Lecture, dwells much on the continuance of the kingly idea in the general of the camp, and in the dictator who was appointed in civil emergencies: at the same time he expresses the intensest horror of tyranny, and his profound reverence for every one who had helped to deliver the country from it, or to prevent its restoration. Niebuhr supposes that this Dialogue was written with especial reference to Cicero's times, to prepare the way for the government of one man, which he saw to be inevitable. Whether it was so or not, the doctrine of the book clearly is, that there is an aspect of monarchy which might be tolerable to a Roman, one which would embody, not contradict, the principle that had been recognised in all periods of the Republic.

If this was the practical faith of the Roman, we may understand how much he differed from a lively and enterprising citizen of a Greek republic, whose mind

was full of schemes of government, and who had had so much experience of the working of a great many. I shall have to compare the general habits of the two people more at large in the next Lecture: I would only draw your attention now to one point; I mean the striking contrast which the struggles of the aristocratical and democratical parties in Sparta and Athens present to the struggles of the patricians and plebeians in Rome. It is not at all strange, that they have often been confounded. There is such a genuine pleasure in detecting likenesses, after the manner of Plutarch, between men and nations, and there *is* such a radical likeness between them beneath all their diversities, that we are constantly tempted to seek for it where it is not to be found. If we adopt Niebuhr's doctrine, which, I suppose, may be considered as thoroughly established, that the patricians were the original Roman houses, we see at once how little the struggles of one set of men to prevent the expansion of the rights of citizenship, and of another to vindicate for themselves rights which they had valour and wisdom to exercise, can have resembled the question whether the government of the best or the government of the people was to be preferred, with the further questions which arose out of those, who were the best and who were the people. It is not necessary to decide, which kind of inquiries was the most interesting. If either had been wanting, there would have been a great blank in the experience of mankind. But we may say confidently, that so far as government and authority over men are concerned, it was desirable, it was inevitable, that they should be

bestowed, not upon those who were always considering where power did reside or ought to reside, but upon those who perceived in the very constitution of man an answer to these questions, and who acted on that conviction. Those who sat in the Senate consulted what was to be done and how it was to be done, as much as any Greek assembly could do; but it was as *fathers* they consulted. In that name they decreed; by that name they were appealed to. So long and so long only as they could preserve the dignity and sacredness which belong to that name, could they preserve the authority of their order. No old titles, no exclusion and contempt of others, could secure more than the shadow of their reverence, when the human family associations which attached themselves to the name had passed away; when they sat merely to carry out the purposes of some faction, or to register the edicts of an emperor.

I think then that I may assume this belief in the authority of Fathers to be distinctively Roman. I do not therefore quarrel with the assertion that it is common and human. The peculiar circumstances of climate, soil, position, which we find in one city, and not in another, deserve assuredly the most careful observation. They help us to understand what its work is in the world. But the most accurate knowledge of the external condition of a nation will not tell us what it is, or wherein its power has consisted. To arrive at any safe conclusion on these questions, you must know what side of human life it has taken the strongest hold of, which of those radical principles that belong to us as members of a species, have possessed and penetrated it most. It

is no paradox then to say that the *peculiarity* of a great people must be something which is not confined to it, but is universal. It is no strange assertion, that Rome could not have been raised above the rest of the earth, could not have had its dominion over men, except in virtue of some quality which every man might recognise as his own. Other people may have had all the same external advantages, or immeasurably greater. The power of turning them to account, of subjecting them to its commands, of converting them from impediments into tools, is what we require; and this power must come from some other source than from the things which it is to make use of; if it wants support we must look elsewhere than to these to uphold it.

There can be no question, from what I have said, that the Roman reverence for parents *did* need support; that it was exposed to continual perils from within and without. The perils were great in the outset of the history. The early legends represent to us the founders of the city, as men willing to adopt all plans for carrying out their purpose, getting wives as they could from the neighbouring lands, by fair means or foul. Such stories, to whatever precise events they may point, are faithful indications of character; they show us the rough hands which have begun great empires; they scatter all dreams of an Arcadian age. In Roman history we have scarcely the hint of such an age; we find ourselves involved, at once, in the habits and the crimes of an organized society. So much the more do we want to know how it came to be organized, what held the

elements together that were so likely to burst asunder, what gave them the sense of obedience, since we cannot, in this case at least, attribute it to the weariness of fighting: no men were ever less weary of it; they longed for it; they were entering upon a life of it. The difficulty becomes greater as we proceed. The city grows more firm and compact: but with this growth its internal struggles become severer; it seems continually as if the body would be actually rent asunder. The strifes of orders must have affected the private life of the citizens, must have disturbed their hearths and homes. External wars, and conquests, the prizes to avarice, the excitements to ambition, must have been felt by every Roman son, must have tempted him continually to break loose from the authority of the Father. Laws were themselves affected by all the causes that affected the manners of the people; their inadequacy to preserve manners was proved at last, was confessed always. Who will guard the guardians? who will teach us to honour that which in itself is weak, while we are strong? This was the problem which all earnest citizens and statesmen had to work out. If they thought they could solve it by their sage maxims and skilful contrivances, the passions in the hearts, the strength in the arms of those whom they ruled, defied and mocked them. The helmsman who depended upon his tricks and contrivances for keeping the sea in order, had to find that there is another law governing it which he must learn, to which he must submit, which he cannot alter. The manliness and wisdom of the Roman consisted chiefly in that he understood this truth better than most

men; he trusted less to his sagacity and more to facts; he perceived that he could only govern by consenting to be governed. Yet he was prone, as all are, to forget this principle; then it proved its strength by his discomfiture.

I have been brought, then, to the direct subject of my Lecture. Some influence was needful to maintain this paternal authority,—customs, laws, sagacity, were not adequate for the purpose. Shall we say that the Roman Religion supplied that want which nothing else could supply? If I put forth this proposition, I might procure an easy assent to it. A hundred facts would immediately come in to support it—the mixture of civil and sacred names in the offices of the state; the attention to sacrifices; the whole science of divination and augury. It might be shown, clearly enough, and Polybius would support the evidence with his authority, that what are called religious sanctions had far more weight with the Romans than with the Greeks, or any people of the old world; that they trembled far more to violate an oath which the name of the gods had confirmed. And hence it would be easy to draw the inference that a machinery which kept them continually alive to the punishments which might be inflicted on them here or hereafter, if they were guilty of crimes, operated on their consciences or their fears with a strength which we cannot in the least measure.

Unfortunately the facts are conclusive—facts to which I must draw your attention more carefully on another occasion—that when the machinery was most perfect, when it was recognised as having this object among all

who took part in the working of it, it did not avail to check the most enormous and deliberate crimes. But supposing there was a moment, a transition period hard to discover, when the balance, strongly inclining towards evil, was adjusted simply by the threatenings of what the Gods might inflict upon the wrong doer,—supposing the pious frauds to which the priests resorted for the purpose of strengthening the popular fears were *not* a weight in the other scale,—can it be shown that, at any time whatsoever, that fellowship of the husband and the wife, that reciprocal government and obedience of the father and the child, which the old agricultural writer dwells on so fondly, grew and expanded under this shadow? Can it be shown, or in the least degree presumed, that the Roman hosts in the old time went forth to throw their lives away for their country's sake, because they had a dim apprehension that he who dwelt and ruled in the Capitol, might do them some greater mischief than the general who led them, or than the enemy if they fell into his hands? Was this the kind of motive to create orderly discipline, or to inspire deeds of daring and devotion? If the religion of the Romans was nothing else than this, it certainly does not in the least help us to account for the virtues either of the hearth or of the camp; still less does it teach us to connect them together, or show how the one might animate and sustain the other.

But if this account of the matter is unsatisfactory, there is another which is sometimes given, and which has acquired considerable popularity in our day, that seems, in this instance at all events, even less tenable.

The religious impulse is said to be that which creates in men high ideas of the beautiful and the good, which raises the nobler thoughts they find in themselves to their highest power, which invests them with divinity, which enthrones them amidst the stars. What warrant the history and mythology of the Greeks afford for this kind of statement,—how easy it is for a person who contemplates their history apart from the history of mankind, or who thinks that it is the key to every other, to regard this view as the solution of all difficulties,—I can readily admit. What I would observe here is, that the Romans were, as we all know, *not* an ideal people; that they were eminently and characteristically the reverse of this; that they never could reverence anything which they believed had proceeded from them, had been fashioned by them; that nothing illustrates this feeling so strongly as their reverence for the authority of Fathers, as their conviction that *this* was the foundation of all other authority. The moment any Roman began to suspect that there was nothing but what he had projected from himself, that moment this reverence fell by its own weight. To seek for the protection of it in such a religion as this, would be the most flagrant of all possible inconsistencies.

But if we throw aside these theories and look at the facts of the case, what do we find? Be it remembered that, for this purpose, traditions which took any strong hold of the popular mind, are facts. They are facts of belief, though not facts of history. They may explain to us what was recognised in the invisible world, though they may give only a confused impression of

what took place in the visible. With this recollection on your minds, consider that story to which I referred at the outset, the story which Virgil, who had been bred in the simplicity of Italian rustic life, who was surrounded by the splendours of the new court, who was a Roman at heart though his intellect had been cast into a Greek mould, felt to be the most faithful embodiment of that old truth which he trusted that the anarchy of the civil wars had not been able entirely to destroy, which he fondly dreamed that the new dynasty might restore. Forget, as we are privileged to do, all about a Trojan colony and a Trojan war, all that merely belonged to the vanity of the Julian family, the want of documents, the carelessness of investigation, and then consider what is implied in the story of a man bearing his father out of the ruins of a fallen city, and coming to Latium after perils by sea and land, with his household gods. Consider those words *Household Gods* in this connexion, and then ask yourselves whether this is a mere tale, illustrating the dry moral, that it is proper for sons to take care of their fathers, or whether it does not give us a glimpse into the meaning of the reverence for fathers, of the authority of fathers,—whether it does not tell us whence that reverence and authority were derived, how they were sustained. Was there not a belief in the Roman such as did not dwell in any other Pagan nation, that there was a fatherly government in the highest region of all, which was implied in the very existence of the household, upon which the permanence of all household relations depended, upon which therefore all civil relations, all civil order, and not less the mili-

tary order, the authority and subjection of the camp, ultimately depended?

I do not assume the opinion of some very eminent scholars to be established, that the Penates were really *the* gods of the Roman State, that Jupiter himself was one of them. Though I feel that that must be substantially a correct statement, I do not wish to build anything upon it, seeing that the inference one would deduce from it follows as clearly from premises which all admit. And while I would maintain the resemblance of the powers which presided over the state with those which presided over the hearth, I would not lose sight of the fact that they retained their own distinctness, that the Roman family was never merged in the State as the Spartan was, that the safety of the State and the freedom of its individual members depended upon the acknowledgment of a number of circles, each having its own centre within the great circle. Where the highest idea of the divine Unity is not recognised, where different powers are supposed to exercise distinct functions in nature, or to demand homage from some special faculty or disposition in man, there I cannot conceive that the home and the country will not be felt to be in some degree under different government; that there will not, at all events, have been frequent clashing of the affections and the understanding, in the effort to regard them as the same. If we contemplate these facts in the light of history and of our own experience, I think we shall be less surprised at the differences and perplexities of scholars upon this point, than at the efforts after unity, the

intuition of it which one sees in this people, just so far as they connected the objects of their worship with the family and with the nation. The moment they lost that association, the moment they contemplated their Gods merely as presiding divinities in nature, as associated with all the vicissitudes of climate, with aspects of the country, with strange and startling phenomena, that moment they became Polytheists in the most radical sense of the word. A pantheon so formed could have no limitations. Each new observation, each new conquest, would people it afresh. And at each step the feeling of that which had been originally implied in the worship would grow weaker; some utterly frivolous or utterly cowardly feeling would be substituted for it.

To affirm that there was any time when the people of Rome were free from this kind of polytheism, or when it did not determine many of their acts, would be to contradict the plainest evidence. But it would be equally, I think, against evidence to say that there ever was a time, when there was not a sense of something deeper than this, when a divine fatherhood did not make itself manifest to them as *the* object of their confidence and their devotion through the different objects which were reverenced at the private or the public altar. It did not signify whence the rites of the particular divinity might be imported, from what language the name might come,—so sure as they were adopted by the Roman of the older time, he saw in them that which did not belong to flowers and seeds and agriculture firstly or chiefly, that which did belong to the family and uphold it. Take a very simple instance which will illustrate

this remark by showing in what way it became forgotten in later times. Ovid, we all know, undertook to be the commentator upon his country's religion. If mere cleverness and liveliness, a knowledge of old fables, and a power of presenting them in an agreeable form, had been sufficient qualifications for this task, no one was fitter for it than he was. The only thing which he wanted was any, the slightest, apprehension of that which constituted the dignity of the Roman, the citizen, or the man. For a right treatment of his subject, no point was so important as the worship of Vesta or Hestia. All the most sacred ceremonies and institutions of Rome were associated with it; the virgins of the sacred fire had affected the character of the nation from its infancy. The fop and sentimentalist of the Augustan age approaches the topic with the jaunty air, which is so characteristic of him, and so intensely disagreeable. He informs us that Vesta means the Earth. He confesses that he had been entirely ignorant till a very recent time of the fact that there was no image of Vesta; that her fire was her only symbol. He then proceeds to tell a vulgar and impure story, by way of illustrating that which had conveyed to his fathers the feeling that purity was implied in the very existence of the home and the hearth. I have more than one reason for alluding to this perversion. In England—I hope it is otherwise in Scotland—Ovid is the writer from whom our boys commonly derive their first impressions of what was believed in the old world, and especially by the conquerors of it. He is chosen partly, I suppose, because the art of writing longs and shorts

may be learnt most easily from him; partly because it is thought that the form under which he presents the Pagan Mythology must show how ridiculous and false it was. What sacrifices ought to be made for the first end, I do not venture to pronounce; the theological calculation I must maintain is utterly false. What such a writer as Ovid teaches us is not to despise and abjure that which is fabulous and mythological, but to lose all perception of that in the fables and mythology which was bearing witness for truth. To him the religion of his country was a stuff out of which he could make verses just as he could make others out of his own sorrows; therefore while we read him, we lose all power of perceiving how it took hold of men's hearts. We suppose that somehow certain fictions were credited by the old world, which have bequeathed a set of metaphors for schoolboys. And so we are not the least prepared to watch the tendencies in our minds out of which the worst of these fictions proceeded, or to reclaim from them that which was in them, not of them,—that which came from a higher source, and was to manifest its might when Paganism had proved its weakness and had perished.

Vesta, we may say it boldly, not caring the least for Ovid's dictum, did not mean the Earth to an old Roman, whatever she may have meant to the Greeks. Nor did her fire associate itself in his mind with physical powers and principles, about which he knew nothing and speculated very little. It spoke to his heart, not his understanding, of that which was nearest and dearest. It connected the sanctity and affection of the Home

with the preservation of the City. It revealed how little one could be preserved without the other. It told him what need there was of a divine vigilance to keep that alive, which a multitude of cold blasts were ever threatening to put out. Such thoughts might not be reduced to shape in his mind. They could not put themselves into words. The forms of the worship were an attempt to express them.

One would doubt of any one instance of this kind. But the more one thinks of the objects of Roman reverence, the more strongly is the same conviction brought home to us. The most obvious example, the one which has forced itself upon every student, is also the most important. The Zeus of Olympus becomes the Jupiter of the Capitol. That which belonged to him as one of his Homeric epithets, is felt to describe his inmost nature. The Compeller of the Clouds is recognised as first of all the Father, the source of Roman law and order; dwelling in the city; its Parent and its King. I associate the two ideas which had such an affinity for each other in the Roman mind, which never could be far asunder, because their union throws light upon those stages of Roman History to which I have alluded already. The passing away of the kingly period, whenever and however it took place, may have been accomplished without that tremendous sense of interruption, that violent wrench in the mind of the nation, which we connect with such a revolution. The story of Lucretia must express the deepest meaning of that event. Whether it actually answers to the fact or not, whether Brutus spoke the words which the poet-historian of the later time attributed to him, or

some yet more simple words, we are sure that it has a place in the enduring records of humanity which no fiction can claim. And this is because the oath which declared that the purity of no Roman house, the honour of no Roman matron, should again be outraged by regal baseness and tyranny, announced the continuance, not the dissolution, of the commonwealth, nay, even of the kingdom. It had been dissolved already, so far as it could be, by the crimes of Tarquin and his son. He had extinguished his own authority; but the authority remained still in that presence which was recognised in the citadel. The royal father there had not abdicated; he retained his claim upon the allegiance of his subjects; they claimed him as their protector and avenger. In the belief of his continued dominion, the fathers could still maintain their original dignity, the Consuls could go forth to the battle against the enemy, could receive the obedience of the citizens. There was all that invisible awe, that certain punishment of the wrong-doer, which, when separated from protection and fatherly government, no priestly contrivances, no plots of statesmen could make effectual to restrain the wickedness of any man who had the power to commit it. The other beautiful story, in which Roman freedom is again involved with female purity, the deliverance of the child with the deliverance of the city, and both with the exercise of the father's affection and authority, still points to the same divine asserter of right, still affirms that human fatherhood is watched over and protected by an unseen father. The act of Virginius in that venerable tradition, was the appeal to a higher law

against that which the Decemvirs were enacting, against any outward force that they possessed. The majesty of human relationships, their inviolability in the case of the humblest man or child, rested upon the faith that a true and righteous government was maintaining the family, was maintaining the city, and would put down any temporary ruler who denied the source from which his power proceeded, the end for which it was created.

I must again observe that the force of this evidence is not at all weakened by our inability to ascertain, how nearly these tales represent the actual occurrence. As a test for ascertaining the nature and the ground of the popular belief, of that which constituted the Roman religion, they have the most indisputable significance. And it is surely this religion of which Niebuhr speaks as being honest, faithful, and veracious. Such names could not belong to it, if it had only led to certain good results. In this place may I not go further and say, appealing to all your national honesty and national faith, it never could have produced results in any degree good, except so far as it was good and true. We dare not call the conviction, the religious conviction, which is expressed in the acts of Brutus and Virginius, false, without undermining whatever is most solid and most deep in our own belief. We must suppose that that religion pointed to something, most imperfectly developed and ascertained, which any clearer revelation would not annul, but confirm and bring into full light.

The other assertion of Niebuhr's, that this religion was something altogether different from Stoicism, is also,

it seems to me, irrefragable. The stoical belief of a Fate, the stoical belief in God as identical with the world, has surely very little in common with this belief in a fatherly government, this reverence for a person, this confession of a power which may be appealed to against suffering and wrong, instead of being called in to account for the existence of it. How Stoicism afterwards connected itself with this older faith, how it put on some of its forms and gave back to it some of its own conclusions, how it came in to supply some of the blanks which the ignorance of the old times had left, to explain and indorse the errors into which they had fallen, I may try to show you in another Lecture. But in the meantime, both the reasons which I have alleged and the authority of the great German historian, will, I hope, induce you to acknowledge that the practical popular faith had a firmer and deeper ground than this school doctrine.

The old traditions which speak of the son of Mars,—the warrior, the lawgiver,—as the founder of the city, of the priestly sage who received his inspirations from the nymph Egeria as the second king, do not, I think, merely offer hints about the races of which Rome may have been composed, and their respective contributions to its stability; they point out also the order in which its institutions must have arisen, the relation in which they must always have stood to each other. The sacerdotal part of the commonwealth, important as it was, was always subordinate to its legal and governing part. It was born to rule and conquer. It learnt to connect worship and sacrifice with that vocation. To forget

this order is to misunderstand the character of the city in all its periods, to lose sight of one of the chief causes of its strength as well as of its weakness. It was this which taught the priest always to look upon himself as the servant of the commonwealth, who was to use his wisdom and his lore for its occasions, not to separate himself from it in the pursuit of certain studies and ends of his own. It was this which tended to make him continually the agent and tool of a State-policy. It was this which taught the Roman to connect the highest thoughts of devotion and personal sacrifice with the service of his country. It was this that disposed him to think of the sacrifices to the Gods as mere contrivances for producing a certain impression upon the minds of the people or the soldiers. It was this which preserved the Roman religion from some of the worst tendencies of the Hindu or Brahminical religion. It was this which made it liable to acquire a kind of falsehood which was peculiarly its own. But we should forget the letter of these traditions, and still more, the moral of them, if we concluded that because some of the more elaborate pontifical institutions may have grown up subsequently, there was not a religion in the Roman state from its outset. It opens with a story of augury and divination. What did those divinations imply? They indicated, I think, from the beginning, they indicated always, a belief that the divine ruler of the city was provident of its welfare, that the future as well as the past was known to him. They indicated a conviction that in some way or other he intended to make his mind known to his creatures, that they too

were meant to exercise foresight, that there must be a means of regulating their acts and designs according to his purpose. The God was believed to direct the city before there had been any careful arrangement of ministers to conduct his service, before the order of the services had been authoritatively settled.

The greatness of Rome depended on this faith. So soon as it decayed, the Roman began to believe in his auguries, in his sacrifices, in his religion, not in a Ruler, not in a Father. Thus the Religion destroyed itself. It affirmed the existence of Gods; it gradually recognised them as its own creatures. What it had formed it must sustain; the first lie cannot live if there is not a second to join with it; if that does not find some other to keep it in circulation. The web becomes more intricate every hour. The danger of disturbing any thread of it seems more terrible. But in some way or other it must be torn asunder; the earnestness, the faith, of the Roman demanded that it should. By what agents and processes the work was accomplished, we may consider hereafter; what good come out of it and what evil. But let us rest for the present in the conviction that Roman history, the further we trace it, will furnish larger and deeper illustrations of the principle that whatever is false is feeble and the cause of feebleness, that whatever is truth must come forth and vindicate its might before the Universe. We need that conviction if we would understand the past; we need it for the work of every day; we shall hold it more firmly when we look back upon our present existence from that which is to come.

LECTURE II.

ROME UNDER GREEK TEACHERS.

MARCUS AURELIUS in his meditations bade himself remember at all times that he was a male and a Roman. Yet Marcus Aurelius wrote in Greek; his studies had been mostly in Greek philosophy; he lived at a time when the Greek culture appeared to have achieved a victory over the Roman intellect, and when Rome had as little right to boast of freedom as any of the cities that she had subdued. Why did the emperor cling so tenaciously to that form of character which one might have expected that a man who possessed his lore, and aimed at his objects, would have almost scorned?

This question touches closely upon some of those which were raised in my last Lecture, upon the relation in which Greek politics, as well as Greek religion, stood to the Roman; upon the relation between the Roman religion and Stoicism. Both these subjects will come more distinctly and prominently before us to-night.

I endeavoured to prove that the authority of the father was the ground of Roman government, the source of the Roman reverence for law, the secret at once of

Roman dominion and of Roman freedom. Whatever was strong in the national mind was derived from this authority, or was intertwined with it. The institutions of the country bore witness of it from the beginning; the witness grew stronger and more marked as they developed themselves. The principle was manifested in the continuous order of the commonwealth; it was manifested quite as remarkably in those events which disturbed existing rulers and introduced social changes. When we turned to the religion, there was a series of facts exactly corresponding with these. The idea of fatherhood and fatherly government was every where expressed in the Roman reverence for their Gods. It gave a unity to their belief, though every thing in the outward conditions of that belief was hostile to unity. It made that worship real and substantial. For the Roman could never suppose that his faith or his conceptions had called that divine power into existence which was the only origin and protection of them. His faith became a palpable and practical contradiction, the moment he dreamed that his own fatherly feelings had led him to attribute the same to the Gods. These feelings perished if there was not some fountain deeper than themselves, out of which they had issued, from which they could be renewed. The honesty and veracity which Niebuhr claims for the Roman religion, must be utterly denied to it if this were not the case.

It appeared to us that the Greek started on that long and adventurous voyage, in the course of which he saw so many cities and men, and suffered so much by sea and land, from a different port than this. It would be

very wrong indeed to say that there was not in him a strong sense of the preciousness and sacredness of human relationships. The Homeric poems would refute by a hundred beautiful stories so rash an assertion. The legends of the Trojan war abundantly testify that the marriage-bond, reverence for its permanence, a determination to punish all violations of it, lay at the root of Greek society. The sense of kindred every where mixes itself with the association in cities, with the honour of the kings, even with the courtesies of enemies to each other. The affection of husband and wife is seen and honoured in the city which the crime of Paris has doomed to destruction. The same habits of mind taking even a stronger form, linking the roving disposition of the sea-wanderer to the sympathies of home, reappear in the Odyssey. And I need not remind any of you that the religious or theocratic element in these poems answers to the human. The Gods have their relationships, their affections, their jealousies among each other; they are parents and kinsmen to the earthly heroes. Those who founded cities could not establish them or rule them, if they could not claim to be the children or the friends of some unseen guardian.

These are unquestionably important elements in the life of this wonderful race. But the more you consider them, the more, I think, you will be convinced that the voluntary relationship, that into which men enter of themselves, and not that in which they find themselves by the law of their birth, was the prominent one in the Greek mind. The wife is the object of the hero's choice. The choice has been confirmed by human laws

and divine rites; gods and men will defend it. No other man, be he ever so great, may outrage it. But Agamemnon may vindicate his own right to the captive taken in war, as being not less agreeable in form or nature than Clytemnestra. This is clearly a state of feeling quite unlike that of the Oriental; but it is no foundation for such a household as the Roman delighted to contemplate.

The sons will probably go forth presently, to seek, under the guidance of fortune better than their parent, for some new home. Firm friendships may be formed, colonies may be established, by these wanderers, not without a sense of strong love for the land that has been left behind. Various political combinations of unspeakable interest to after times may be attempted by them. There may be the general council and the clever tyrant; but the stable polity, the settled dominion, must be sought elsewhere.

A similar observation applies to the religion. The Homeric gods sympathise with men, mix in their battles, teach them various arts; but it is impossible to feel that they have a right to govern, that they are exalted above the tempers and passions of those who inhabit the lower world. If Zeus holds the scales in which the fate of two combatants are poised, he is open to the importunities of Aphrodite or Thetis, to the rebukes of Hera. We feel instinctively that such beings might attach themselves to many impulses and affections of men's hearts, might be invoked in many moments of pleasure or of distress, might be felt to inspire the singer or the sailor or the warrior, might represent many movements

in the natural world, but that they could not, strictly speaking, be revered. They were the elde brothers or sisters of the human race; the awe of fatherhood did not dwell in them.

Consequently the Greek was always liable to fancy that he was the measure and standard to which all things must be referred,—that laws, institutions, principles, gods, were his offspring. This, I say, was his tendency. And it is to the struggle against this tendency, the struggle to find some foundation to rest upon which he did not create, that we may trace all the noblest efforts of the Greek mind in its legislation, to a certain extent in its art, to a still higher degree in its later poetry, more completely still in all that is enduring of its philosophy. The lawgiver must find an authority to which he can appeal, that is raised above those who are the subjects of it, that is not at the mercy of their caprices. The Dorian would vindicate this authority, even though taste, cultivation, the very freedom which he maintained against external despots, were abandoned to secure it. The Ionian, who could not submit to such sacrifices, must try to maintain the higher part of humanity against the lower, the intellectual against the animal. The fight was a very hard one. For though his countrymen might have the keenest intellects ever bestowed on any race, they were also in the completest sense animals, always ready to use their intellects as ministers of their lower appetites. The sculptor might assist in counteracting this tendency, if he could present the objects of worship in beautiful forms, with the highest intellect pervading and quickening them. The human

creature might at least see that they were elevated above himself, though they were sharers of his nature. The dramatic poet took a higher flight. He discovered in the old traditions of his country witnesses of a divine law which would bend to no human phantasies; of crimes—above all, crimes against the relations of life—avenging themselves after the lapse of generations; of a fixed unbending destiny which did not prohibit the strife of human wills, but overcame them. Then came the eager search of the philosopher for some principle in physical things or numbers, or in human nature itself, to which all things might be traced, and which no inventions of men could alter. Then came his vehement protest against the Homeric gods as creations of man's fancy; then his vindication of that which is in itself against that which is produced by any art; then his assertion that the excellence that dwells in the Gods must be the ground and type of all human excellence, and that man must not dare to impute his wrongs and perversities to them, unless he would make his standard of what was right for states and individuals mutable and useless.

These works are, it seems to me, grander in their ultimate aim, more instructive by their connexion with each other and with Greek history, more valuable even in their defects, than for those separated and isolated beauties upon which admiring critics are wont to dwell. They help us to perceive a unity of purpose in this nation, like that which I have endeavoured to trace in the Roman. The aspiration of the Greeks after an ideal of humanity, after a wisdom which is implied in

all the acts of the understanding of the highest men, but cannot be limited to them or derived from them, may be seen in the rudeness of the Homeric life, no less than in the greatest refinement of the age of Pericles, or in the loftiest designs of Alexander. It may be seen in the confused Mythology of the Homeric poems, and seen also in the protest against that Mythology in the Republic of Plato. In comparing the two periods, the evils which were developed in the later time and had not been developed in the earlier, the deeper truths which had come to light in the later period and that had not come to light in the earlier, and which made the false notions of that time manifest, we have a right, I am sure, to affirm concerning Greeks what I did affirm concerning Latins, that in no case was the lie productive of good, that in no case was the detection of it productive of evil. No, nor of unbelief. On the contrary, there was a seed of unbelief, of irreverence, of contempt for what is divine, in all the Homeric fables. The faith which was latent in these fables was the confession of a great eternal verity; the seed of irreverence and unbelief was unfolded in those who, with the Athenian Sophists, proclaimed man to be the standard and measure of all things, and in those also who with their enemy, Aristophanes, clung to the old traditions respecting the gods, and yet made the gods the objects of sport and ridicule. The seed of good and of truth was unfolded in those who maintained in fact, or sought to prove by argument, that there is a substantial and universal Righteousness and Wisdom which must be confessed by all who would be righteous and wise themselves.

But it does not follow because the Greek mind had a great and glorious problem of its own, which it was trying to work out,—of which if it could not discover the solution, it might show us whence the solution is to be expected,—that it would, therefore, make its work intelligible to the Roman. There are many evidences that it did not, many satisfactory reasons why it could not. If there is any part of Greek speculations which we might suppose would have had an affinity with the Roman intellect, it is that part which refers to polities and politics. Two of the greatest works of the greatest philosophers of Greece were directly occupied with this subject. They were familiar to Cicero, as to all the accomplished Romans of his time. He held the names of Plato and Aristotle in the profoundest respect. He regarded Plato as more eloquent than almost all professors of eloquence. Nevertheless, there is not the slightest proof that his own political ideas were determined, even greatly modified, by their teaching. His fragment on the Republic shows that he had learnt his idea of institutions and of society in an entirely different school; and if in the book of Laws there is more to remind us of the work attributed, rightly or wrongly, to Plato under that title, his saying, that he preferred the Twelve Tables to all the dogmas of the philosophers, was undoubtedly sincere. I do not see how it could be otherwise. The most memorable and striking passages of Plato's Republic, those which were most valuable to Greece, and may be precious to Britons, Germans, or Frenchmen, did not meet at any point the thoughts which had been awakened in Romans by their polity, encountered a set

of questions and difficulties with which they had never been exercised, pointed to an ideal which they had never dreamed of. On the other hand, the practical suggestions in that book, which they could understand, must have been utterly shocking to them. *We* may see how Plato came to defend a community of wives, the experiences of modern Europe helping us even more than any reasonings; we may feel that with his knowledge and his ignorance, it was almost impossible that he should not regard so fatal a result as the condition of a perfect society. The Roman could only look upon it as the most accursed scheme for the dissolution of all society. In Aristotle's polity he would find no such blot. Human relationships he would there see treated with profound reverence, as the primitive types of all the most advanced forms of political life. But even in this beautiful conception there would be something entirely alien from the habits of his mind. Each relation seems considered by itself, as if it might unfold itself into a separate kind of government. The parental authority is not here, more than anywhere else in Greek literature, that centre to which all the other aspects of human life are referred. And there is in Aristotle an utter want of the divine groundwork of these human relations, which the Roman never forgot. Partly for that reason, the relation between the master and the slave has none of the embryo filial character which it had in the Roman family. It is based by Aristotle upon the great principle that the intellectual being must rule the animal; the perilous deduction from that principle, that the Greek was meant to rule all other creatures,

being as little disguised in the theory of the master as it was in the practice of the pupil.

Hence it was not possible, I should suppose, for a Roman to enter heartily into either of these master-works, or even into the great Greek histories of which they were in some sense the expositions. Herodotus was too free and cosmopolitan for the home taste of the Latin; Thucydides treated of those wars of principles of which, in the Republican time at least, he had no experience. At what point, then, was it possible for the Greek intellect to come in contact with that which was so unlike it? How was the affinity created which was afterwards productive of such remarkable effects? However little a hasty *à priori* reflection might prepare us for such a result, it was Greece when it had become unpolitical, when social problems had been either cast away by its sons in despair, or had been merely connected with the phenomena of the universe; it was Greece deprived of its great masters, fallen under the tyranny of mere commentators and debaters; it was Greece framing schemes of the universe to console herself for the loss of the moral freedom and intellectual dominion which she had once sighed for and almost grasped; it was this Greece, so prostrate and helpless, which appealed to the hearts that had been nourished in the traditions of Brutus, and Fabricius, and Regulus; it was this which excited the terror of their elders; it was this, which no denunciations and protests could prevent from introducing into the city legions of thoughts directed apparently against a world into which the Roman arms had never been carried.

What was this new world which Alexander had not discovered, but which men so much feebler than he was dreamed that they could conquer? It was one which had not been unvisited by the imagination in former days. Greek legends had spoken of a lord of the sun, a lord of the air, a lord of the deep with all the treasures that lay in it, a lord of the subterranean abyss and its fires. Beside these, had dwelt the possessors of different stars in the firmament, forms that haunted every glade and rivulet, Tritons and Naiads innumerable in Poseidon's kingdom, male and female powers of horror and vengeance that executed the commands of Pluto. All had human tempers, characters, sympathies, shapes; all spoke of different emotions and habits, of gladness, of wonder, of terror, in human hearts. But the acts and offices of all were connected with the operations of nature, with those operations which were most familiar to Greek observation and experience. The impulse to penetrate into nature, to examine its secrets, as well as to turn its powers to account, had therefore been fostered not only by the necessities of the husbandman and the sailor, but by the teaching of the priest, by the belief of the people. The voices of gods and goddesses seemed beckoning, even wooing, the shepherd and the fisherman to ascend the hills or plunge into the ocean caverns where they had their dwellings. The passion had been felt by the earliest Ionian philosopher, and had been rewarded by useful discoveries. Thales had calculated eclipses, and given help to armies. It had also been the cause of dangers. Anaxagoras, living in the most intellectual period of Greece, had main-

tained that a higher intellect than that which was directing the sculptor or the poet must be ruling in the stars. His doctrine had seemed to his countrymen worthy of banishment. They craved for human fellowship and sympathies in their gods; he seemed to be substituting for them a cold abstraction. It was otherwise with the warm-hearted patriot Empedocles, amidst the volcanic wonders of Sicily. To him everything in the operations of nature suggested thoughts of the affinities and antipathies of men and of kingdoms; to these, as to ultimate principles, he referred them.

Such dreams and explanations had no longer any interest for the Greek thinker. Even the dogma of Anaxagoras had become too personal for him. But the desire to understand nature, and to connect it by some link or other with human life, had descended upon him as the last relic of his ancestral inheritance, which he might still boast of, and might perhaps improve in his own hands. The Epicurean retained most of that side of the old Greek feeling which connected nature with man, and made it subordinate to his interests and delights. But in place of the fresh joyous sympathy with nature as the kinsman of man, as peopled with beings like him and caring for him, the dull dry maxim that he is to get all the pleasure he can out of it, had to be sustained by a theory which showed out of what seeds, and by what combinations, the great system had come into existence without any creative energy or will. The gods, Epicurus honoured as beings having those very tastes and forms, that indolence and apathy, which

he regarded as the perfection of humanity. So far he reflected something of the temper of those ages which he ridiculed; only to carry out his idea and preserve men from anxiety about the future, these higher human beings must be entirely excluded from all relation with and dominion over those who dwell upon this planet. On the other hand, the Stoic would ascribe the most restless activity to the gods, the most unceasing interest in what men were doing. How could it be otherwise? For were not they the moving powers and energies of this world, another name for all the secret and manifest powers and operations of nature, by which for good or evil we are most affected? How reasonable then to pay them homage! How wise were all the precepts of antiquity respecting their worship! All the philosopher can add to the old doctrine is a still higher reverence for the world itself, the *whole* divinity of which these are parts. All he has to do is to observe the fixed undeviating fate which regulates its acts and movements, and to submit himself to the same rule, quenching joys and sorrows, fears and hopes, as caprices unworthy of one who has risen to the apprehension of a government so calm and stedfast. To break the chains of Epicurean and Stoical dogmatism, to use that method of Plato by which he sought in the conflict and collision of two truths to discover a higher wherein both were involved, for the oversetting of all affirmations and the maintenance of a perpetual equilibrium, was at last the sole function of the Academician. But in his progress to scepticism, he halted at several stages, coquetted with several positive beliefs, always left an opening for

practical acquiescence, even while he was most fostering the habit of speculative doubt.

How these three forms of opinion acted on the Roman mind, what their influence was on the Roman faith, we must learn not by guesses but from documents. Cicero's book on the Nature of the Gods is the classical one on the subject. It would be difficult to imagine one more interesting and more valuable. But I cannot help thinking that the meaning of it is sometimes mistaken, owing to prejudices which we bring with us to the study of it. I will point out one or two of these before I proceed to speak of the book itself.

Gibbon has said in a well-known passage: 'The 'various modes of worship that prevailed in the Roman 'world were all considered by the people as equally 'true, by the philosopher as equally false, and by the 'magistrate as equally useful.' I will not now speak of the first member of this triad. It does not directly concern our present business. But if the second is correct of the philosophers, under which name must be included all the teachers who influenced the Roman mind—all the persons in Cicero's dialogue—the most notorious facts must mislead us, the plainest passages in the book must have some new and strange sense put upon them. Apparently Velleius, who maintains the Epicurean side in the controversy, asserts with good faith that the gods have human forms and natures, and applauds his master for worshipping them in secret, though he did not admit their interference with the administration of the world. A very large part of the argument of Balbus in the second book is devoted to the defence on philosophical

grounds, and not as a question of personal expediency, of the old Roman legends respecting the gods. He is vehement and prolix in this argument, and he connects it with the fundamental maxims of his school. Cotta, the Academician, is the only one who treats these legends with anything approaching to levity. He was himself the Pontifex: Balbus appeals to him with great solemnity not to forget his office, and what it involves. He declares, abandoning for the time his laughing mood, that nothing which he says must be taken as in the least at variance with his sacred functions, but that he does not conceive he is bound to respect the Stoical arguments in support of the traditions, because he respects the traditions themselves. I am not saying yet how these words are to be accounted for; I merely say that, as this conversation is supposed to take place among friends, opening their minds to each other with perfect freedom, not scrupling to utter words that must have sounded very strange to their countrymen, Gibbon's dogmatic assertion must require very great explanations and deductions, before it can even approach the truth.

What I have said about Cotta, or rather what he says about himself, may seem amply to confirm the other dogma, that the magistrates regarded all religions as equally useful. How much the religion of Rome always, even in the earliest times, was liable to become a state religion, I admitted in the last Lecture. How much the danger had increased with the growth of the commonwealth and the enlargement of its limits, I am most anxious that you should remember. It is this fact

which accounts in a great measure for the opposition which the Greek literature and philosophy encountered from such Romans as Cato the Censor; this explains the eagerness with which they were hailed by the younger men. The Censor had a strong conviction that the religion had some very close connexion with the order of the state, with the preservation of its polity. What the connexion was he knew as little as men of his character and class generally do; he had a vague impression that somehow people were kept from crimes which his office did not enable him to suppress, by invisible terrors. He thought that traditions of heroes descending to the battle, must stimulate the courage of the legions. He may have found it convenient sometimes, to stop the holding of the Comitia by a sinister augury. With these calculations there will, I conceive, have been mixed up the old patriarchal feeling of the Romans, a sense that the glory of the Roman homes was departing, a just and humble confession that his own faith and practice were inferior to those of his fathers, a belief that his office laid upon him the responsibility of not abetting a further degeneracy. There is no difficulty in sketching such a likeness as this; numbers of men in all times and countries might sit for it. Of course there will be marked individual lines in each case. But this, or something like this, I suppose, would be a fair representation of the motives and arguments which created the Roman *Graiophobia*. And the Roman Graiomania in the young men will have had as intelligible an explanation. They had been led to reverence veracity as a specially Roman virtue, and

they found themselves surrounded by men who seemed to think it their Roman duty, to maintain a show and an appearance of truth for the sake of a certain result. They had been taught that Order belonged to the Roman state, and they found a multitude of disorders perpetrated in its name. They heard of the sacredness of relationships, they saw very little of it; the feeling of them had not passed in any strength into their own hearts, though there was a lingering consciousness of their worth, and even of their power. Their ambition, a Roman ambition, led them to be desirous of being conspicuous in the forum. To be so they must have a skill in debate which did not belong to their ancestors, as well as an acquaintance with many things of which they were ignorant. Here were teachers who boldly looked into the facts of the universe; here were men who spoke of an order much more perfect than the Roman order; here were men who taught a severe self-restraint, such as the older Romans had practised; here were men who cultivated the faculty of seeing the two sides of a question, and of showing what might be said for each, as it could be cultivated nowhere else. These were reasons strong enough why magistrates of the Roman people, and those who were aspiring to magistracy, should reject the Greek learning when first it appeared in Rome, or should promote it. They indicate a mixture of feelings on both sides; the honest with the impure, the manly with the frivolous and the cowardly. But they do not warrant the charge against either, of that monstrous wickedness which Gibbon imputes to the most eminent men of the Republic as of the Empire

that they had no other reason whatever for supporting the religion of their country, than that they considered it a serviceable lie. There was probably no man in Rome, not the best and noblest of all, who might not at times, by words or acts, yield to this abominable habit of mind. If it had not been so, the Republic would not have fallen. But I am convinced there was no great man, not Cotta, certainly not Cicero, in whom another and totally opposite feeling did not dwell; combining with his most sacred Roman traditions; not only sustaining itself in spite of his Greek philosophy, but often by the help of it.

No one doubts, I imagine, that Cicero's character is a complicated one, hard to describe faithfully upon a single hypothesis, capable of being contemplated on various sides, supplying plentiful excuses for a severe criticism as well as for cordial admiration. Since he was the man who was most perfectly seasoned in Greek literature of all his cotemporaries; since he was at the same time essentially Latin in thoughts, language, affections, character, and regarded all his Greek culture as ornamental and subsidiary; since, nevertheless, he has taken more pains to show us how it might in his judgment be helpful to the main object of the Roman's life;—he must be the best illustration we can find, both in his person and in his writings, of the whole subject. His vanity belongs to himself; his political oscillations, and his domestic failures, much more to his time; the uncertainty of his conclusions, to his education both in the schools and at the bar. But beneath all these there lies the Roman reverence, the Roman sense of duty, the Roman tenderness and affec-

tion, and, I must add, laying stress upon the adjective, the *Roman* love of truth. That love of truth was altogether distinct from the Greek love of it. Truth in itself Cicero did not pursue or care for, or know the meaning of. But truth in institutions, truth in character, truth in the ordinary dealings of men, he did admire very heartily, even if various influences to the right and to the left made him deviate often and sadly from his standard. Now it is absolutely impossible that any one of these habits of mind could exist in a man who, consciously and habitually, regarded the worship of the gods of his country as something merely useful to the magistrate.

Whence then arises that allusion to the two characters of the priest and the reasoner, which occurs in his dialogue, and which does not seem to have caused him any great shock? I think the cause may be traced very clearly in the dialogue itself. It is evident that the graceful and accomplished Romans who discuss the question about the nature of the gods, are in themselves earnest energetic men; but that they are not more than half in earnest when they are met for such a business as this. It is not that there is any intentional levity in their manner; it is not that they would not bring all the force and energy of their minds to bear upon it; it is not that the eloquent reporter is not doing, as he always did in every work little or great, his very best. But it is, that they have a reserve of faith, as practical men, as men of work, which enables them to treat controversies, however interesting and important, as belonging to leisure. It is not the least a life and death question

with them, whether Velleius or Balbus is right. The actual reverence for a divine power cannot, they think and very often say, be in the least affected by the determination to which this or that argument may lead them. If we take Cotta's words literally, and interpret them liberally, this is what he understood when he claimed the right to be as sceptical as he liked in his mere reasonings about the nature of the gods. Whatever he did believe, he says, he never could believe with Epicurus. Yet he could gratify the follower of Epicurus by showing that all which Lucilius urged in favour of the popular mythology, as included in his great world-god, was entirely futile. Cicero himself concludes, to the surprise of his reader, with saying that he differed from Cotta, the patron of his own sect, and was inclined on this subject to agree with the Stoic; an assertion of which he makes his brother afterwards remind him in the book on Divination. Evidently his intellect went with Cotta, who demolishes Stoicism with the rhetoric of his reporter, not his own. But because the conclusion of Balbus seemed more to favour the faith in a divine presiding power, he accepted it, being convinced that that was true, whatever else might be false.

Before we assume that either Cotta or Cicero thought this belief was to be upheld merely because it was useful, we should recollect what always was and must have been a Roman's test of truth. That which could support nothing, appeared to him essentially unsubstantial. That which was able to sustain such a state and republic as Rome, had in it tokens of solidity which could not be gainsayed, which must be confessed, however difficult

it might be to prove by other evidence that it was strong and ought to stand. It was this test which made him feel the weakness of that which he had borrowed from the Greeks, and which, as far as words and logic went, seemed so much less assailable than that which he had inherited. All these controversies and conclusions of the sects were no basis for a society, could keep no society alive. There must be something firmer and deeper than they were. If it was not the traditions which had been so intertwined with the history and growth of Rome, what was it? Must it not be something *in* them which no patriot, no true man, could dare to part with, which he must maintain against the world and against himself?

But then to discern what this was, became every day more difficult. For there were two processes going on simultaneously, each of which made the other more perplexing. There was that process of decay in the inner domestic life of Rome, and, consequently, of decay in its institutions, which continually warned all thoughtful Romans of coming ruin; and yet, as it affected their own characters and the clearness of their own vision, made them less able to understand wherein the greatness and safety of their city consisted. It was easy to feel and denounce the cruelty of factions, the venality of officials, the oppression of provinces—easy to foretel whither all these were leading. But it was not easy so to trace all the symptoms to the constitutional malady from which they had proceeded, as to avoid the trial of a number of plausible insufficient remedies, some of which were hastening the death of the patient. It was

most difficult to one who sought to preserve the springs of the nation's life, not to be tender also of the mud in which they were hidden. It was at least as difficult for one who saw how necessary it was to sweep that away, not to overlook the only instrument of health and purification.

For it must not be forgotten that though the Roman did not give up his traditions for the sake of his philosophy, his philosophy was in a number of ways acting upon those traditions, and showing large portions of them to be untenable. This is the other process to which I alluded. Their joint effect is nowhere, I think, so visible, as in Cicero's work on Divination. Niebuhr, I have been told, though I cannot remember to have read the passage in his writings myself, has somewhere denounced this book with great vehemence, considering it as the worst exhibition of Cicero's character, with which in general he is disposed to deal very tenderly. I can see some grounds for such an opinion. The dialogue is a far less interesting and agreeable one, than that on the 'Nature of the Gods.' Cicero's brother, who defends divination on Stoical maxims in the first book, argues his case as if he expected to be confuted. Under cover of his name, Cicero is able to introduce long extracts from his own poems, which are brought forward as an argumentum ad hominem, to convict him of attaching faith in auguries respecting the Catilinarian conspiracy. When he proceeds to demolish these pleas in his second book, there are more signs of direct disbelief in the popular faith without any clear assertion of the grounds upon which he would tolerate it, than are at all consis-

tent with the sincerity and manliness which one wishes to give him credit for, and which in general, after all deductions, we feel did belong to him. But the more we look at the book, the more, I think, we shall be inclined to qualify the censure which we may at first bestow on it, to acknowledge that the difficulties belonged more to the nature of the subject than to the timidity of the writer, and to perceive that he was struggling to be honest, in the midst of all his temptations to keep one doctrine for himself and to leave another for the people.

The important point in this dialogue is that Quintus Cicero is defending the old traditions in the new and fashionable mode. He is the Le Maistre of Roman augury. It is exceedingly delightful and agreeable, of course, in his opinion, to believe what his revered forefathers believed; but it is still more delightful to be able to justify them upon refined maxims which they never dreamt of. Quite in the spirit of his modern imitators, Quintus is destroying the root of the traditions, while he is vindicating all their most extravagant outgrowths. 'How can you tell that the birds may not denote such and such things by their flight? Why should not there be correspondences between the internal appearances of beasts and the events of a campaign? Do you understand all the mysteries of this great world? What curious relations there are between the life in plants and the life in the human frame! Is not all medicine grounded upon them?' These and the like formulas, with which we in our day are so painfully familiar; these appeals to the ignorance which should prompt us to seek for knowledge as an excuse for being always

without it; these arguments of mock humility which must make real humility for ever impossible; these encouragements of a universal scepticism, as the only way to an undistinguishing faith, were all tried and exhausted 1900 years ago, in this conversation. It is surely a very high honour to Marcus Tullius Cicero that he detected the covert atheism which was lurking in them. He strikes a direct and deadly blow at the Stoic, who pretended that the world was all governed by a fixed fate, and yet could admit an art which made the course of events subject to accident. He asserts, with peculiar clearness, which one scarcely looks for in a Latin, the dignity of science, as being a continual escape from accident. But he does more. He clearly shows that it is a profaneness and wickedness to connect the divine nature, with which we ought to associate all permanence and stedfastness, primarily and chiefly with those things which belong to the realm of change and uncertainty. He may not follow out the conclusion as satisfactorily as we might desire; but when he utters his conviction at the close of his book, 'that it is the part of a wise 'man to defend the institutes of his ancestors, by re-'taining sacrifices and ceremonies; and that the beauty 'of the world, and the order of celestial things, demon-'strate some excellent and eternal nature, which is to 'be the object of wonder and reverent regard to the 'human race; but that, at the same time, all the roots 'of superstition ought to be cast out, because it inter-'feres with all stedfastness and quietness of mind,' we may trace, I think, a very strong, however imperfectly developed, conviction, that the ground of all that had

been good in the worship of the Roman people—good in their institutions—had been not a faith in accidents or portents, but in the providence of a Being superior to all these, who may direct the flight or fall of a sparrow, but who is trusted because order, and not caprice, is the ground of his counsels.

There is one most striking paragraph in the book on 'the Nature of the Gods' which I have dwelt upon with wonder, and which has been to me a great help in apprehending the thoughts which were at work in the author of both these books, and in the Romans of his time. It occurs at the close of that long speech of Cotta's in which he seems to have shaken the Roman Pantheon to its centre, exposing the different conceptions human and natural that had contributed to form it, and in which he had apparently sounded the very depths of scepticism, maintaining all events and actions to be a maze without a plan, and the wise man to be more miserable than the fool. 'All mortals,' he says, 'account 'that all outward conveniences, vineyards, harvests, 'olive-yards, the abundance of fruits, the commodities 'and prosperities of life, come to them from the 'gods. But Virtue no one ever thanked the gods for 'bestowing upon him. They are right, no doubt. For 'we are justly praised for virtue, and in our virtue we 'have a right to glory. And this would not be the 'case if we had it as a gift from a god, not from our-'selves. Whereas if we have gained any increase of 'lands or property, or if we have obtained any accidental 'good or driven off any accidental ill, then we give the 'gods thanks, for we suppose nothing has been gained

'for our own honour. Did ever any man thank the 'gods that he was a good man? Of course not; but , that he was rich, that he was honoured, that he was 'out of danger. It is for these reasons they call Jove 'greatest and best; not that he makes us just, tempe- 'rate, wise, but that he gives us safety, abundance, 'wealth.' Here, no doubt, was the secret of the whole matter, what the Roman in his heart was searching after,—a god who should propose it as the first end of his dealings with his creatures to make them right and true,—who should in this way justify the fatherly character which the traditions of their country had attributed to him. To believe there was such a Being was most difficult, for the reason which Cotta so simply and honestly assigns. How could they then compliment themselves upon their virtue? How could they credit themselves with it as their own? If it was absolutely necessary to their dignity as Romans, or their dignity as philosophers, to do this, the aspiration after such a divinity must be for ever unsatisfied. But it might be discovered to some, by the blackness of their country's crimes—by more melancholy experiences in themselves, —that it was necessary to their sincerity as Romans, to their wisdom as philosophers, *not* to do this; to do just the reverse of this,—to confess that the rectitude or manliness which was in their fathers, that the craving for these which they discovered in themselves, were gifts which must have come from some higher source than a god of vineyards, or olive-yards, or money. Those who acquired that conviction might look nature in the face more sturdily and manfully than any Greek philosopher,

might believe in an ideal of humanity higher than any Greek of the old time had yearned for, and yet might recognise a parental authority which did not belong more to the infancy of his nation than to its fullest manhood, not more to it than to all the tribes which it had conquered, and which it was appointed to civilize.

I had intended to dwell at some length on the evidence for these conclusions which arises out of one of the non-theological treatises of Cicero, that fragment on the Republic to which I referred in my last Lecture. I wished to do so, chiefly that I might show how inseparably the two sides of Roman life were connected, and how impossible it is to understand any of those thoughts which seem to take a philosophical form in the later Roman literature, till we have seen them tried in their application to government and to affairs. But I will content myself with referring you to one passage, interesting in itself, but far more interesting in its relation to the whole object of the work. It is the passage in which Scipio begins his discussion on the different forms which a commonwealth may take. I should wish you to consider it only as it stands in the genuine fragment, not to make it stronger, as Mai does, by adding some sentences from Lactantius, wherein he professes to give the sentiments of Cicero upon the divine monarchy. Scipio affirms that he must begin his speech, as Aratus begins his poem, from Jove. When he is asked why he should imitate a poet in a grave discourse upon States, he says that it does so happen, he cannot tell how, it may be by the contrivance of princes for their own ends or for the general utility, but somehow

people have consented to speak of one king as ruling in the heavens, as ruling Olympus by his nod, as the common king and father of all. Ignorant men may have adopted the opinion, it may be embodied in fables, but it would seem as if the most learned people in the world had used the same language, and defended it on grounds of reason.

This is evidently no idle exordium. Scipio wishes to account for the origin of kingdoms, and to show that however intolerable they may have become, there is an excuse for them in the nature of things, and that a state may revert to that kind of government without falling into a tyranny. There is a hesitation about the language, which was, probably, more characteristic of Cicero than of Scipio; of the time which followed the assassination of Cæsar, than of that in which the later factions of the Republic were only commencing. But this very hesitation shows more remarkably what was passing away and what was at hand. The belief of a father of gods and men did, as Scipio intimates, lie very deep in the heart of the Roman commonwealth: no dread of the name of kings could extinguish it. While it lasted, they might rule beneficially, or consuls and the senatorial fathers might rule without them; the law was observed, the unseen majesty remained. When it was shaken, the terror of an Olympian Jove would not be less strong; it would not less clothe itself in fables and fiction; but the whole character of the belief would be changed; it would, in fact, be a belief no longer; it would be the horror of an oppressive God of nature, not the trust in a protecting God over men. And then it

would speedily enshrine itself in a human form. Not a father-king, but a Divus Imperator, a god-general would come forth, to turn citizens into slaves.

Before this change took place, Roman Stoicism had tried what it could do to restore the state, and it had given the clearest proof how essentially different it was from the old character with which it had allied itself. There was more of that character in Brutus than, probably, in any of his contemporaries; a more genuine and earnest wish to uphold the forms and institutions of his country, at whatever cost to himself. There was, probably, more in him also of the domestic affection which had once made the Roman home so cheerful and graceful. But these beautiful relics of a former world must be adapted to that in which his lot was cast by being set in a stiff, artificial, pedantical framework. The Fate which he confessed, could not make a Roman heart bow to the force of circumstances. It only made him rigid in his adherence to old maxims, unable to perceive what was demanded by the times he lived in, and wherein lay the best hope of something better. The genial government of the man who had most sympathy with the soldiers and people,—who, in spite of all his faults, had proved that he understood what Rome might do for ordering and forming rude nations better than any of her sons,—was intolerable to men who, if they had realized their highest dream, would only have produced a poor lifeless copy of a noble original; out of whose conspiracy there came, in fact, nothing but factions, proscriptions, anarchy, and a readiness in their countrymen to accept with joy any dictator, though he might

have ever so few of the better qualities of the one they had lost. Had philosophy, as Gibbon represents it, been plotting the overthrow of the old Roman religion, that religion would have had its ample revenge in the feebleness of its rival to destroy a form of society or to restore one. As it was an attempt to reconstruct the old religion, everything being carefully preserved in it except its principle, the question more and more craved for an answer, whether in any way the principle might be asserted and shown to be immortal, though all its adjuncts should perish.

That was not the question, apparently, which presented itself to another illustrious Roman, who was equally removed from the academical scepticism of Cicero, and the republican stoicism of Cato and Brutus. The elder poets of Rome had been the conservators of its heroic legends, those who expressed its belief in divine friends and protectors. Ennius appears to have mixed some philosophy with his belief. Yet his countrymen honoured him mainly as the collector of traditions concerning the life and growth of their city, and especially of those that connected it with the gods. How strange then is it that the first complete Roman poem, —the greatest, as many think, that Roman genius ever gave birth to,—the greatest of which it was capable— should be one in which the whole religion of the ancient world is denounced passionately,—it would scarcely be a paradox to say, fanatically! Lucretius does not merely lift his voice against it; he aims at the extirpation of it. The hope of accomplishing that object, of delivering mankind from the terrors of the unseen world, and of

the powers which had been thought to preside over it, bears him through all the amazing difficulties of his enterprise, enables him to discover poetry in the speculations of so frigid a thinker as Epicurus, to reproduce dry arguments in free and living verse, actually to compel the language of his country, nursed as it had been in camps, to accept the toughest compounds which the pliable Greek had discovered for philosophical use, without destroying its native purity or strength. So remarkable an achievement would have been impossible if there had not been an intensely fervent purpose in the poet; his mere genius might have struck out a number of much pleasanter paths. In fact, the main interest of the poem 'On the Nature of Things' arises from this cause. However we may dislike his theory, we can scarcely help attributing to Lucretius a moral earnestness such as did not belong even to the best writers of the Augustan age. It is far more true of him than of the satirist of a later time, that 'indignation made his verses.' No describer of human battles is more passionate, more thoroughly alive, than he who undertakes to represent to us the war of the atoms out of which the world arose. He charges at the head of his tremendous Greek syllables, as men of the former day broke the phalanxes of Pyrrhus, or, amidst desponding trials and reverses, encountered Hannibal upon their own soil. Nay, strange as the assertion may sound, it is the ancient Roman feeling, which inspires him with such an intense detestation of the practices which had become identified in his mind with the religion of his own country and of Greece. His horror at the tradition

respecting the murder of Iphigenia is an indication of his reverence for that paternal instinct and duty, which Agamemnon abandoned at the command of the prophet who said that he uttered the voice of the god. In spite of his belief that the gods take no interest in men, he is continually invoking them and imputing to them personal sympathies. His primary elements have more humanity in them, than many epical and dramatical poets succeed in imparting to their men and women. And every where some magnificent simile comes in to illustrate one of his philosophical maxims, which show what his heart was really interested in, whatever indifferent entertainment his intellect might be providing for it. Thus in his second book, when he is to illustrate the doctrine that there are different kinds and forms throughout the universe which must be referred to differences in their original elements, he bursts out with a passage, delicious alike for sense and sound, which it is better to render into the rudest prose than to disgrace by a poetical parody. 'If it were not so, how 'could the child confess its mother or the mother confess 'her child, which we know they can do, so that it is 'not only among men but in all creatures that they are 'mutually known. For oftentimes before the splendid 'temples of the gods a calf hath fallen, slain beside the 'incense-burning altars, breathing the warm blood of 'life out of its breast. Meantime the widowed mother, 'traversing the green copses, leaves on the ground the 'tokens of her cloven feet, visiting all places with her 'eyes if perchance she may see anywhere her lost 'offspring, and fills with her moans the leafy wood as

'she stands gazing, and oft returns to the stall, pierced 'through with the love of the young that is lost. Nor 'can the tender willows and herbs fresh with dew, 'nor the streams gliding along between their high 'banks, avail to comfort her mind and avert her anguish. 'Nor can all the other kinds of calves along the glad 'meadows draw her mind away from the one or soothe 'her care. So true is it that there is something proper 'to each, which each perceives and asks again.' There must have been an exquisite tenderness as well as strength in the heart of a man who delighted to trace these sympathies through all nature, which he must first have learnt to know for himself. For the kind of attraction which he attributes to these animals, is not that which the pantheist sees everywhere as the substitute for all human bonds and relationships. It is the reflection of these in a lower sphere. It is the mother and the child, not some magnetical affinity, which he perceives, 'among the cattle and the wild beasts, and 'the finny race, the various birds that frequent the 'waters, and the fountains and lakes, and fly through 'the pathless woods.'

Were the vulgar notion of Lucretius the true one, that he is the poet and philosopher of chance, attributing to it that which his more devout predecessors had maintained to be the work of a divine mind, such passages as these would be mere inexplicable inconsistencies. But there is not even the slightest justification for this opinion. Lucretius certainly felt himself that he was escaping from the region of chance to the region of order. It seemed to him that the

popular mythology was built upon accidents and omens, and that there was no safety or rest but in the discovery and acknowledgment of fixed principles. How much he failed in the search for these, with what a grand Titania-affection he embraced an ass's head, it might be easy to point out if it were necessary. But that he was in search of an order, and that the order which alone could satisfy his mind would have been one that is higher and nobler, not meaner and poorer, than that which those speak of who think of the Creator of the world merely as a great artificer, must, I think, be evident to those who read his poem seriously. He craved for a Father of men, not merely for an Author of nature. Till he found what he sought,—or at least while he found such images presented to him, such acts demanded of him, as implied that the world was governed by no such Being as this, but by one altogether unlike *this*,—he preferred to deny a Providence altogether, to wrap himself in a theoretical atheism.

If we pass from Lucretius to Virgil, the contrast is in all respects as great and startling as it can be. And yet, as I endeavoured to point out in my last Lecture, the result is the same. The reverent observer of his country's traditions, the man who will exercise all his native talent in reproducing them, who will make all his Greek culture subservient to the adornment of them, teaches us that very lesson which we have been learning from the poet who hoped to see religion trodden under the feet of philosophy, and who believed that it had been the instigator of the greatest evils in the world. What the one seeks to present to his countrymen, is

a hero whose only memorable quality is his filial virtue and reverence, who confessedly derives that quality from the household gods he bears with him, they being in the higher region what Anchises is in the lower. What the unbeliever craves for, what he curses his country's traditions for not showing him, is this same image. He will abjure them all; he will meditate upon atoms, and their original diversities and attractions; he will refer himself and all things to these; unless you can make him feel, that not in dead traditions, but in living power, there is a Ruler who can explain why the maternal instinct is so mighty everywhere—why the power of the father had made his own nation so glorious—why, when that power was changed into a tyranny, his nation grew so weak and so contemptible. Virgil was doomed to a greater disappointment than Lucretius, for he thought he saw a father of his country and a beginner of a new era, in Augustus Cæsar. But perhaps a clearer glimpse might be given to him than to the other, of a fatherly kingdom which would be as wide as that of the Cæsars, if their legions were not to extend it, if their palace was not to be the centre of it.

At all events, Marcus Aurelius may have had some good reason for reminding himself,—when his Greek philosophy led him to forget the fact or to wish himself something else,—that he was born a Roman. He was right in thinking that to be that in its fullest sense, was to be a great and noble man. He was right in thinking that only a religion which befitted a male,—which was strong, substantial, efficient, which was not sickly or

effeminate, which spoke of rule and authority—could be the support of such a character. He had a right to ask also, that this authority should be of that kind which the Roman had confessed in his best days, should be that in its most perfect form, should prove what it was by fact, establishing its claim to obedience by tokens which men could recognise. He had a right to ask that with the manifestation of this authority should be joined the manifestation of that ideal of humanity which the Greek had longed for. One of these conditions was certainly necessary, probably both of them, to any religion that should preserve the empire from decay and ruin. Unless it were found, the Roman eagle might continue to be a bird of prey, but it would never mount up to behold the sun and draw light from its fountain.

LECTURE III.

ROME AT THE BEGINNING OF THE NEW WORLD.

In my last Lecture I commented upon a sentence which occurs very early in the history of the "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire." I could not easily have found one that was more characteristic, in its form or in its spirit, of that work and of its author. All religions, it said, were equally true in the eyes of the Roman people, equally false in the eyes of the philosopher, equally useful in the eyes of the magistrate. There speaks the acute observer of a falling or fallen world, from that point of view which the eighteenth century afforded him. He appeared to himself to be judging most fairly of the past; he was really transferring to the past the habits and the despondency of his own time. The preface to the first volumes of the History is dated in the year 1776; the preface to the entire work in the year 1788. It was completed, therefore, one year before the breaking out of the French Revolution; all the tempers and modes of thinking which belonged to it, are those of which that event was the climax and catastrophe. The people,

the philosophers, the magistrates, in the different states of modern Europe, were thinking then very much as he supposes they must have thought under the Republic and the Empire.

I believe we shall not do justice to this eminent historian, or learn the great lessons which his work is able to teach us, if we approach it without this recollection on our minds. If I may judge of others by myself, it is not easy to express the magnitude of our obligations to him. We become more conscious of them, the more we endeavour to put our thoughts together respecting the long period which he has described to us, or to consider particular portions of it. We are not only bound to admire his patient toil, his faithfulness in the study of documents which a large majority of his cotemporaries, and probably of ours, would suppose that he had no occasion to meddle with, and the power which he has of awakening our interest in the dullest subjects. These are very great historical gifts; but the historical genius is more exhibited when a writer enables us to understand that heterogeneous events are connected, that history is really a drama, every scene of which has relation to some centre, and is bearing us on to some issue. The melancholy grandeur of Gibbon's book remains with us and grows deeper, as we look upon any picture of the ruins of Rome, or meditate upon the world that has grown out of them. His solemn and stately style is felt,—even the more for its want of nature, of freedom and variety,—to be the proper garb for a funeral procession, such as he brings before us and compels us to join. It is a majestic

spectacle to see Greeks and Goths, hordes from the steppes of Asia which Pompey and Cicero never dreamed of, the Moors of Africa, nations in all costumes and of all religions, joining in that procession and attending the fallen conqueror to his tomb.

If one conceives of this as the object of our illustrious countryman, it does not seem at all strange that any signs of returning vegetation on the old and worn out land, any indication that there were virgin soils which were capable of cultivation, should disturb rather than attract him. They were interruptions in his narrative which must be explained away, if they could not be made to illustrate its course and augment its gloom. The sports and the laughs of the schoolboy which Gray surveyed with such pleasure when he had a distant view of the old Eton towers, would probably have been rather distressing to his somewhat sensitive and fastidious nature and his recluse habits, if he had come into close contact with them. He would then perhaps have been reminded that those who urged the flying ball, or enthralled the captive linnet, had not merely sorrows in the far future of which it was bliss to be ignorant, but had their own present griefs and quarrels, their sins of violence and of fraud, which were as real and as intensely felt as any that could come forth in maturer life. The boyhood of nations must in like manner have been a very disagreeable subject for Gibbon. However brilliantly he may sometimes describe it, the noise and the turbulence must have been utterly ajar with the feelings with which he was contemplating the dying out of a society in the fulness of refinement and civilization.

And all appearances of a new element in the decaying mass, everything which threatened to hasten its decomposition and to create something different out of it, must have been regarded by a man writing with such a purpose at such a time, angrily and impatiently. If it could be shown,—and how well might it be shown from undoubted records which had been unfairly concealed or disfigured,—that many of the worst evils of the old world mingled with that which threatened to displace it, and that other evils had been added to these, how eagerly would such facts be brought forth and set in their fullest, broadest light! If it could be shown,—and what evidences there were in Gibbon's day to warrant the hypothesis,—that a principle which seemed in the second and third centuries new and immortal, was helpless, almost defunct, how naturally was that which would have been bitterness turned to scorn; how calmly the narrator could afford to trifle with what he thought was proving itself to be insignificant; what new force he could give to his picture and his moral by showing us that Roman greatness was not all which was destined to decline and fall!

I have complained of the judgment which Gibbon has passed upon the thinkers and actors of the old Roman world. I am far less anxious to refute his judgment of the Christian Faith and the Christian Church. If the rules of your Institution permitted me to engage in polemics for the former, I should decline the task, being convinced that if that faith cannot defend itself by appealing to the consciences of men and the facts of history, my arguments would serve it very

little. As to the latter, I am of opinion that Gibbon has done more for it than most ecclesiastical historians, inasmuch as he has shown as they have not shown, what a substantive power it was in the world, how impossible it is to speak of the Roman Empire as a civil writer should speak of it, without taking account of the questions by which it was exercised, of the acts, good or evil, that it has accomplished. Instead of pleading for a greater liberty, in touching upon topics which have their theological as well as their human side, than his example would authorize, I shall neither venture nor desire to meddle with controversies, which he has judged it a necessary part of his duty carefully to discuss. Nor can I be tempted to judge less severely of the misdoings of the Church, than he has done. In proportion to our estimate of the influence which it was meant to exercise over the progress and civilization of the world, must we be inclined to indignation at its shortcomings; an indignation that must be roused by many acts which he would have tolerated, though it may be mitigated by a consideration which could have had no place in his mind, that we have inherited the same responsibilities, and lie under a heavier guilt. Subject to that weighty reflection, the admission may be freely made, that he has rendered a service to Christianity by every faithful exposure which he has made, of the crimes or mistakes of her champions and patrons; that he has no further misrepresented them than he has misrepresented the course of the world's history; that he had a right to believe the success of their Gospel was owing to second

causes, if there was not a principle in it which could reform society.

This observation leads me to speak of an historian who belonged not to the eighteenth century but to the first and second; who did not see from a distance the gradual falling of the edifice which it had taken ages to build up, but mourned over one tumbling column after another, with the earnestness and foresight of a patriot. Many would describe Tacitus as a much more melancholy writer even than Gibbon. They feel that nothing was ever written so tragical as his Annals and his History, nothing which ever impressed them so much with the sense of gigantic power passing into weakness or a curse. I acknowledge at once that Tacitus is *the* Roman tragedian, that he has taken the only subject upon which a Roman could write tragedy;—not the sorrows of Œdipus or the crimes of Medea, but the 'rushing into slavery of consuls, senators, knights,' the corruption of domestic manners, the growth of military tyranny, with the certain signs that it would be avenged by military insubordination. As Tacitus wrote from his heart, as he was a man before he was an historian or a philosopher, I admit also that he is more capable of inspiring us with the sorrow which oppressed him, than an easy man of fortune and of letters in the eighteenth century, devoting himself to the study of past events with ever so much fidelity and even interest, can possibly be. But I cannot allow that Tacitus leaves us in the same despondency, in which Gibbon would leave us if we accepted his inferences as well as his facts. His picture of Rome itself may afford us no consolation.

As his eye travels over the different frontiers which legions are guarding, the prospect looks even more dismal. Noble specimens of an older time, like Germanicus, are soon taken off by the jealousy of the tyrant, after they have resisted the temptation to put themselves in his place. The miserable son succeeds to the throne which the illustrious father could not occupy. The pupil of the philosopher becomes the plague of the universe. But if we turn from these faithful narratives to the 'Life of Agricola,' still more to the book 'On the Manners of the Germans,' the spectacle is altogether changed. The former may be chiefly valuable as a graceful and dutiful tribute to a father-in-law; as a commemoration of one of the great men who were left in the most degenerate times. Yet it cannot be overlooked, by any Briton at least, as the most curious and interesting document respecting the kind of civilization which Rome, when her governors were honest, could produce in a barbarous province; as authentic and valuable a testimony of that which she could *not* do, of her inability to raise up a national or a moral life, in the country that received most readily her discipline, her polity, her luxuries.

The other book, which should be read in connexion with this, carries the moral much further. I do not inquire how far the statements of Tacitus are to be depended upon. I have heard an eminent Gothic scholar, a pupil of Grimm, say that the more he read the book on Germany, the more he wondered at its accuracy. But if Tacitus was as ill-informed as some have given him credit for being, if his book was as

much a romance as some of those which were written in the last century about the islands in the Pacific, I should still regard it, in connexion with what we know of the after world, as full of significance. No one can doubt that Tacitus saw in that country which Rome had been unable to conquer, a power which might do something much more terrible in the way of destruction, than it had done when it slew the legions of Varus, and yet which he could not view without a certain joy for its vigorous and youthful life. If you ask how he could take so much more pleasure in contemplating such a life than Gibbon did, though it was a far more portentous vision to him, I answer, Because he had that which Gibbon wanted. He understood wherein the nobleness of old Rome had consisted; he saw how much domestic life, the reverence for fathers and for wives, had to do with it; he had kept those sympathies warm in himself amidst all that was dull and cold around him. And therefore it was impossible that he should not hail these when he saw, or thought he saw, them reappearing in tribes ever so remote from Roman civilization, ever so unwilling to receive the Roman yoke. It was no treason to his country, it was the effect of his patriotism, that he recognised these domestic patriarchal institutes as the appointed and necessary elements of a human society. He would have led his countrymen, if he could, to see the virtues of their own ancestors in those men who had as yet received no external polish, who were ignorant of the arts of life which the Roman worshipped, in which he supposed civilization to consist. Therefore it was really the love

for the old which made Tacitus just to the new. He discovered fresh sprouts where all seemed to be dead; he perceived that the family principle was immortal, even if Roman institutions which had sprung out of it were condemned to die.

My object in this comparison will, I hope, be evident to you. Tacitus can be as little appealed to for controversial purposes, by a defender of Christianity, as Gibbon can. He had the vaguest impressions of what it was, of its very name. The Christian body presented itself to him, as the most fanatical sect of that nation which it was necessary for Vespasian to put down, and about the institutions of which therefore it behoved Tacitus to gather what loose and fragmentary notices he could, from authorities not specially trustworthy. But Tacitus felt those evils of the Roman world to be the causes of its misery, and of its coming fate, which Gibbon regarded chiefly as subjects for amusement, or as furnishing the materials for some unclean note. No one is so magnificent a painter of drapery as the Englishman: no one helps us to look into the inmost heart of the society which he describes, like the Roman.

When we speak of the domestic life of the Romans during the Empire, it is very likely that our thoughts turn first of all to Pompeii, and the information which we have received from it respecting Roman houses. It is excusable and significant, that we refer so naturally to these indications respecting the private existence of this great people, that we scarcely remember there are any others, which do not belong to them in their civil and out-of-door character. Unquestionably the ordinary

Roman in the time of Tiberius or of Claudius would have taken the same view of things. The house would have meant for him, the dwelling, the hall, the chambers, the feasting room, the baths: 'What else,' he would have asked, 'is a house but that? How does one 'differ from another, except in the richness or taste of 'its outward or inward decorations?' And yet, within that house so decorated, certain persons still continued to dwell; and they continued to speak,—probably with more refinement than their ancestors,—a language which intimated by a thousand forms of expression, that the house did not consist of certain walls, but of beings such as they were, and that upon *their* relations to each other it depended, whether it was a noble house or an ignoble and detestable one, whether it was to send forth Roman citizens, or men like those Asiatics whom Rome held that she had a commission to subdue. The vulgar maxims implied in the use of these words of course were scouted; the words themselves could be used without any pain or distress, because the sting had been taken out of them,—the sense of them was departed. But the sting had not been taken out of the facts. They remained good. The household,—that is, the persons dwelling in the house,—had the same power to make each other miserable, as when they knew nothing of porticoes and paintings. There could be plots among the slaves, rebellions of the sons, contrivances of the wife against the husband and the husband against the wife, anticipations of the death of the parent, testamentary frauds, poisonings, assassinations. All these, not only Roman satire but Roman history tells of. We

are not left to the evidence of excavations; domestic history is not fixed in relics of marble: it is written most broadly and legibly and frightfully in every book which has been bequeathed to us, by competent and intelligent observers. Perhaps it may be written, too, in the book of nature, in the volcanoes which the luxuries of the Roman dwellings were not able to avert, and which carried them away.

It would, however, be a most rash and uncharitable thing to say that the people of Pompeii were sinners above all those that dwelt in Rome, as it would be a contradiction of history to say that the visible punishments which befel those that dwelt in Rome were less terrible than theirs. What are the annals of the palace of the Cæsars from Augustus to Vitellius, but a laying bare of the domestic crimes of those who were called fathers of their country, and of those who were nearest to the throne? What are they but accounts of the vengeance and retribution which followed their acts? If Nero's life was held to be the climax and consummation of all foregone atrocities, it was because his hands were dipped in the blood of his mother. If his punishment was the greatest, it was not because he at last suffered murder himself, but because he was pursued by the terrors of conscience as none other had been; because, in the words of the historian, 'When he had perfected his 'crime, its greatness became intelligible to him, and 'so through the rest of the night, sometimes fixed in 'silence, oftener rising up in fear and deserted of sense, 'he waited for the light as if it would bring him de-'struction;' and because neither the apologies of philo-

sophers nor the wickedness of that mother herself who had drawn him into the hatefullest crimes, could hinder him from hearing 'the sound as of a trumpet and her 'cries on the hills and from the sea.'

In his beautiful narrative of this event, Tacitus mentions another fact which is most illustrative of the time. Seneca was to employ his rhetoric and philosophy in extenuating the act to the Senate: 'but meantime 'Nero's friends went to the temples, and then, following 'their example, all the neighbouring towns of Campania 'began to testify their joy at his supposed deliverance 'from treachery, by offering victims to the Gods and 'coming in embassies to the Emperor.' The combination is complete. This was the popular as well as the imperial religion of the time. When a great crime had been committed, the temples must be thronged, partly to put a different face upon it before men, partly to make it acceptable to the gods. The more terrible the enormity, the more need of religion to cover it or to make up for it. How certain was it then that this religion would spread and multiply under the Cæsars; that every day would cause it to be regarded as more indispensable; that poor Stoicism, even with so able and subtle a champion as Seneca, should be quite unable to offer any substitute for the encouragements and the concealments which it afforded! Add to this the restless anxiety to know something of the future, the impatience of men who had nothing in the past or present to rest upon, at least to get a glimpse of what was behind that veil, were it never so terrible and hideous, and one may understand that

there never was a richer field for the priest and the conjuror to work in than that which this age presented.

And now came the fulfilment of that doctrine respecting the condition of the slave, which I maintained, on the authority of M. Savigny, we ought never to attribute to the Roman institutions. An eminent statesman, in one of the earlier debates on West Indian emancipation, quoted the celebrated passage in the 6th Satire of Juvenal, which describes the punishments inflicted by a Roman matron on her slave, to explain what a system was prevalent in the Roman empire at the time when Christianity appeared in it. I do not mean to express any opinion upon the inference which he deduced from the passage: but it certainly never can prove, that the idea of the Roman family involved these cruelties, or any. 'So I will; so I command: let will stand for 'reason,' are the words in which the lady asserts her right to do what she likes with her own. They are words which imply a time when law was despised and trampled upon, when the maxims of arbitrary rule, recognised in the highest sphere, had descended to the lowest. They could have had no place in a satire describing the foul abominations which this one describes, if there had not been a protest in the Roman heart and conscience against them.

That conscience was certainly never extinct. And before Juvenal wrote, there had been a change in the condition of the empire, beginning with the era of Vespasian and only interrupted by the dark days of Domitian. Even those days were apparently profitable,

inasmuch as they taught the people to appreciate the government of emperors who tried to be fathers, and taught them also to see how little they could depend upon the continuance of such a government. There was a kind of moral indignation against the crimes of Domitian and his officials which had not been awakened by the atrocities of Nero. The orator and the philosopher were then employed in finding a justification for court-wickedness; now the best of them mourned over it, and, when they could, exposed it. The panegyric of the younger Pliny upon Trajan, if it reads to us like flattery, was certainly a genuine expression of the delight of a good citizen in discovering that it was possible for a ruler to feel responsible for his subjects, to regard them in some measure as his family. It was not that the abominations of the land ceased by magic, on the appearance of emperors having these dispositions: Gibbon's dream of the happiness of the world during the second century is scattered by a multitude of facts which his honesty would have forced him to record, if he had surveyed that portion of the history less rapidly. The influence of the better government was shown much more in its permitting free censures upon the state of society,—in giving us the materials for knowing how corrupt it was,—than in any real reformation. That itself, however, was an unspeakable benefit; the moral standard was raised; there was just so much of light as enabled the Roman to perceive the darkness: the Empire was so improved that patriots had courage to dream of the Republic. Above all, they could perceive that the dissolution of domestic man-

ners was the curse of all curses, which the utmost official diligence, if it had descended from the highest Ruler to the governor of every province and to the centurion of every cohort, could not have removed. The later emperors of the second century were evidently much more deeply aware of this fact, than their more showy predecessors, Trajan and Hadrian. The name which was bestowed on the first Antoninus, denotes that he cultivated filial piety as the chief of Roman virtues, and that his subjects had discernment to see that in doing so he was entering into the spirit of the old institutions, helping to revive the old life, and so doing more for his country than if he had conquered the Dacians, or, like Hadrian, had affected all Greek taste and cultivation. Marcus Aurelius, who had that cultivation, without Hadrian's pretensions and vices, used it expressly for the purpose of sustaining in himself and in his subjects, what he perceived to be the proper native character. Self-examination, an acknowledgment of the downward tendency in man and of the need of a divine teacher to raise up that which was better and higher in him, resort to all the aids of thought and devotion so far as he knew them, were in his judgment the necessary means for enabling him to fulfil his duties as a son, a ruler, a father.

And yet, with all his sincerity, the household of Marcus Aurelius was the most melancholy of spectacles; the empire passed out of his hands to the most wretched of sons. The fact had been demonstrated, that there was no power left in Roman Religion, cultivated by the most honest and devout of its votaries,—in Greek

philosophy, rescued from all its meaner adjuncts, turned to the most practical account, industriously and happily associated with what had seemed most foreign from it,—to quicken and renovate that which every patriot,—that which Marcus Aurelius, the most consistent of patriots,—felt was essential to the preservation of the city and of the world. Thenceforth one hears of no such experiments as he made. The best emperors are only trying what they can do to enforce the authority of law by the help of the jurisconsults, and the obedience of the legions by severe schemes of discipline. If the Empire can possibly be kept from breaking to pieces by these instruments, the achievement is wonderful. The man who can avert an invasion or put down a rebellion, is a hero and deliverer,—one who is for a moment suspending the anarchy, which returns the next generation in all its fury, and in which all foresee that the state must at last be ingulfed. Meantime, those tribes whose character Tacitus endeavoured to study in the country which he saw furnished the most perfect specimen of an external barbarism with a root of order and future civilization, those tribes were beginning to measure their strength against the power of Rome, to see whether it was not a match for the most perfect discipline, as far as art went, when the spirit of discipline had departed. This is surely the meaning of that momentous struggle of which there had been so many foretellings, but which Romans understood to be one for life and death, from the time of Decius downwards. The phrases by which we often describe it, are certainly quite inadequate. When we speak of a battle of bar-

barism with civilization, we have need to define both our terms. They may be both valuable, if we will give ourselves a faithful account of them; they are both deceitful, if we assume that we understand them because we can make ready use of them. It *was* civilization that was defending itself with the arms of Rome: but it was that civilization which the Annals of Tacitus, the Satires of Juvenal, the chapters of Gibbon describe to us. It was a civilization exhausted of its civility, a civilization with which the civis or citizen had no longer anything to do; it was a civilization which demanded all religious sanctions to uphold it, all religious impostures to make the different parts of it cohere; a civilization out of which *the* religion had departed upon which Niebuhr bestows the epithets of sincere and veracious,—that which protected, as he says, the integrity of the people as well as of their institutions. On the other side there was barbarism,—all the vices of barbarism, much of its weakness. But there was not merely, as we sometimes delude ourselves with thinking, great physical strength and the capacity of enduring heat and cold. That capacity, which depends so much upon exercise and education, was greater in the hosts of Rome than in those to which they were opposed. It was *the* treasure bequeathed by past times which had not been wasted, which every new occasion was again able to call forth. And if there was in some of the barbarians an unusual robustness of frame, that was owing, as Tacitus so clearly points out, mainly to moral causes, to the freedom from habits which were destroying the heart more than the animal vigour of the

Roman youth. It was the presence of this heart, of this manhood, in the Germans and the Goths, of a principle of union not created by laws or accidental association, but derived from the sense of kindred, from the human relationships, that made them terrible. And this feeling of kindred, which was liable of course to be disturbed by a thousand influences of individual selfishness and ambition, was upheld by the belief of divine powers related to the human warrior, of gods from whom the kings had issued, of helpers in the battle, of a Society awaiting them after it was over, of struggles going on in the heart of man and of nature with powers that were adverse to the peace and order of both, but which, through mighty conflicts wherein men and gods were engaged together, would at last be put down. This faith had surely in itself a meaning and a sincerity such as the early Roman faith had; yet it was different in kind as much as in outward form and colouring from that. There was in it more of the sense of government and authority than in the Greek belief, more that craved for authority and would be ready to recognise it. There was an immeasurably deeper reverence for women, than even the stories of Andromache and Penelope warrant us in attributing to the Hellenic people. Still, the reverence for the hero, for one who unites the man with the god, much more brings back the race Homer describes, than that which bowed to the father-king in the Capitol. The Gothic faith contained no substitute for this. Unless it could in some manner blend with this, and be subordinated to it, one does not see what escape there was for the people who held it,

from that brutality which degraded and perverted their nobler and manlier qualities.

It would have seemed to be the business of Rome in the world to bring about this union, to stamp the image of its own paternal authority, and of that wonderful order to which it had given birth, upon those who were likely to continue for ever in a kind of wild boyhood, unless there were some to prepare them for the distinct purposes and steady work of manhood. But how could Rome fulfil this task? She never, as we have seen, was able to exercise the kind of power over these tribes, which she had put forth with so much success among the Celts of Gaul and Britain. And supposing she had acquired that position, supposing she could have commanded them as she did the others, what different materials would she have found awaiting her skill and discipline! How could she have taught them the lessons they were wanting to learn, when she had herself utterly forgotten them? Without these lessons, how would her superficial culture have been cast aside by the strong hands and stout hearts, which at last conspired to take it away from herself!

If all religions were equally true for the people, useful for the magistrate, and indifferent to the philosopher, there could be no reason why, when the craving both for religion and for novelty was so strong among the people, when old religions were proving themselves so ineffectual for the purposes of the magistrate, when the philosopher was inquiring what helps he might find to uphold the feebleness of his theories and resolutions, a newer and fresher set of dogmas should not

have proved acceptable to all three. Had Christianity presented itself in that shape to the inhabitants of the Roman empire, it need not have waited two centuries for Philippus Arabs to give it a brief recognition among the tolerated and naturalized religions of the empire. It might very soon have been permitted by the mild wisdom of Trajan, to cooperate with other instruments in keeping the world peaceable and submissive; it might have been allowed by Marcus Aurelius to take its turn with the lessons of various schools, by all of which he sought to regulate and improve his life. Trajan determined that it must be proscribed, and its professors punished; Marcus Aurelius, in his double character of monarch and philosopher, ratified and carried out the sentence. Nor is it easy to see how men contemplating Christianity as they did, and anxious as they were to preserve the existing order of society, could have come to a different conclusion or adopted a different course. For these new teachers did not come forth with a set of manageable opinions and maxims, which might be balanced and compared with those that had already gained currency among thoughtful men, or been rejected by them. They declared that they had good news for men of all sorts and conditions; for the slave as well as the freeman, in the provinces as much as in the capital. Those who proclaimed this good news spoke as energetically as Lucretius had done, against that whole system of sacrifices by which the nations had sought to conciliate their gods. They proclaimed these to be cruel, as he had done; they spoke of them in the old Hebrew phrase, as abominations. But they did

not merely promise the student and investigator of nature an emancipation from this system, and the theory of the invisible world upon which it was based,—they offered that emancipation to the people. The ground of this emancipation was the very one which Cotta had pronounced to be impossible, unless men were to give up boasting of their virtue, and claiming it as their own. The new teachers affirmed righteousness and the power of attaining it to be the highest and most heavenly gift; to be received, not procured; for the sake of which the loss of vineyards, olive-yards, health and life, might be well endured,—that loss being itself oftentimes part of the treasure. And this message and gift were affirmed to proceed from a Father who was revealing himself as at the root of the universe and of the life of man; of whom the Jupiter of the Capitol had been the phantom, and before whom he must disappear. It was not possible in any way to identify *this* Being with the world-god of Stoicism. He was declared to be the Creator and Ruler of the world. It was not possible to put him at a distance from the affairs of men, as the Epicurean did. He was declared to be the Archetype of which men are the image, to be conversing with them through One who was the elder brother of their race, to be acting upon them, governing them, reforming them. It was not possible to treat this message as a theory not affecting the conditions of social life. This fatherhood and brotherhood were declared to be the foundation of a no less comprehensive society than the imperial; all subjects of the empire were invited to claim citizenship in it.

Gibbon has certainly not exaggerated the intrusiveness and audacity of such a proclamation as this; he has greatly underrated it. If he had fully apprehended it, he might have made a more successful if a less ingenious defence of the Roman emperors than he has done. He might have called upon all equitable and reasonable Christians to ask themselves how they would have acted if they had been in the place of Trajan or of Marcus, and not to cast a stone at them for their persecutions, till they are clear about the answer. The more one considers the circumstances of that time, the further one looks into the past history, the more does one appreciate the difficulties of their position, the more clearly does it appear, that their private virtues and their zeal for the well-being of their subjects may furnish the most natural explanation of their policy. They could have afforded to despise any enthusiast or body of enthusiasts, that sought to bring back the old forms of the Republic. These had been tried, and had failed; every wise man would have said, 'What can we gain 'by going round the same weary circle? We shall 'return to this point again. Surely these Emperors are 'giving us as free a government as we can bear.' They could in like manner have afforded to despise any system which was really, what the people believed Christianity to be,—atheistical. The worship of the Gods was so wrought into every part of the work and enjoyment of human life, it was so identified with old traditions, it so little disturbed any modern pleasure or taste, that there was no apparent reason why the multitude should wish to be freed from it; they had ten

thousand motives for cleaving to it, though no state influences were exercised in its favour. But a society coming forth in a divine name,—so like that which had commanded all ancient Roman reverence, so unlike all that they habitually invoked; a society speaking with the authority to which Rome had bowed when it was a village, assuming the universality of Rome now that it ruled the world, bidding men of all different heterogeneous faiths confess one Father, and shake off that which separated them, had a far more formidable aspect. Wise men could discern that the insignificance of those who professed it did not make it less dangerous if it could stand its ground. That insignificance naturally tempted them to try whether it could measure itself against the power of the Empire; whether it might not be shown by palpable proofs that the clear heaven which the Christian said lay behind that which was filled with the objects of the world's worship,—a heaven at the same time much more closely connected with the earth than that was,—had not been discovered, but only dreamed of.

Upon the trial of this issue the conditions of the modern world were to depend. It is a mistake, I conceive, to suppose that we can trace the progress of it if we allow our minds to wander vaguely over the vast circuit of the Empire. But it would be a still greater mistake to suppose that the Christian Church chose out secret glens and corners remote from the corrupt civilization of the time, for its principal achievements, and that it is in these we are to look for the decisive battles in which it triumphed or was discomfited. It

was in the great commercial cities, where the characteristic accomplishments and the characteristic evils of the old world were the most fully developed, that the new faith established its first holds; it is in these that we ought to study its workings. The more minute the examination the better: I can but throw out two or three loose and obvious hints.

Antioch is the city which we naturally think of first in connexion with the Christian name. It combined various elements of the old civilization. It was Greek, and born into the world at the time when Greeks were most eager to stamp their own image upon it. Yet Antioch was Syrian in much of its temper and habit of thought. It was not unaffected by the colony of Jews which had settled in it, after its monarchs had ended their vain struggle to subdue the Jewish worship. Finally, the Roman proved here as elsewhere that he had a strength to which the most opposing tendencies and influences must submit themselves. Hither the Christian teachers came as soon as they had passed the limits of Palestine; hence they went forth on their first incursions into the outlying world. Here Trajan found the society which taught him, that a kingdom was springing up in the heart of his kingdom which might undermine it. Here he perceived the necessity of removing the spiritual father, that the bonds of spiritual brotherhood which were holding together the Christians in the city, and connecting them with distant cities, might be snapped asunder. The event did not answer to his expectations. The bond appeared to be made firmer by the death of Ignatius. Divisions soon effected

more for the object he aimed at, than he could effect. Still the Society lived on, and grew stronger from all imperial experiments to overthrow it. The question had yet to be decided, what this Society was doing to alter the condition of Antioch Society. The records of the first two centuries afford no satisfactory answer to that question. The third suggests a more painful one, whether Antioch Society may not be doing much to alter the condition of the Christian Church. A Bishop in Queen Zenobia's time, probably patronised by her, is reported to be assuming the airs and dignity of a Roman official. But his flock is scandalized. Partly on that account, he is deposed by his brethren. A general persecution soon follows. Antioch bears her share in it. Then comes Patronage. The Eagle in the capital and the provinces has stooped to the Cross. Christian Doctors can lift up their heads and challenge the homage of those who have despised them; nowhere is there a school of them more esteemed and more learned than at Antioch. It can send forth reasoners and debaters for the confutation of Heathens or Jews, or for carrying on the controversies within the Church. But we want to know what this school is doing for the city in which it dwells? The fourth century gives a very emphatic and a very sorrowful reply; from the lips of two men entirely unlike each other in temper, character, faith. The first is the Emperor Julian. He finds Antioch just what we know it to have been three centuries before,—frivolous, capricious, devoted to pleasure, without manliness, without heart. The testimony might be suspicious. Julian disliked Antioch, for Antioch dis-

liked Julian. But it did not dislike our other authority. John Chrysostom obtained the reverence and fear of its citizens by the nobleness of his life; the brilliancy of his speech made him popular in spite of its frankness. And the Church presbyter far more than confirms all the denunciations of the Heathen Emperor. We may learn from his discourses there, how depraved and ignoble the population, rich and poor, was; the rich far more than the poor. That there should be a man to tell us so,—a man to declare in the name of God that it ought not to be so,—a man to defend the weak and uphold the mighty, and to feel that in doing this he was simply fulfilling the work which he and the whole body whereof he was a member had been sent into the world to do,—this is something to make us wonder and rejoice. But the fact is not less certain. This brave asserter of a fatherly and righteous government over men, makes it clear by his words that this belief had not penetrated into the heart of the people among whom he dwelt, and that till it did so, the city could not be reformed, could not be recivilized by the presence in it of teachers wise and good as he was, of the most accomplished schools, of the most complete ecclesiastical organization. This truth was established in the fourth century. It became more manifest in all the subsequent Syrian history, till that great crisis, when the armies of the Prophet, insupportably advancing, swept away that civilization, and bore witness that the name of a divine *Sovereign* in which they fought is mightier than all theories and speculations, mightier than anything but that name of divine '*Father*,' which

the Arabian did not know, which the Syrian had forgotten.

The city of Carthage presents quite a different phase of civilization to this. There the native Punic element had been utterly crushed, when the cry, 'The old 'enemy must be blotted out,' went forth from the Roman senate and people. Then the language, institutions, education of the Latins took possession of the country which had so long resisted their arms. All these had been carefully transplanted, and had taken such root in the African soil as they could take, before the Christian teachers came to sow their seed in it. Eminent men had watched the growth of that seed, had used no little pains by loud cries, and sometimes by ugly scarecrows, to hinder the birds from gathering it up. There more than anywhere had been vehement protest against the corrupt Pagan practices, and against the meddling of Christians with them. There more than anywhere the lines had been drawn deeply and broadly between the new Society and the old outlying world; there more than anywhere, had ingenious methods been invented, for detecting false teachers and exterminating them. By the third century we may hope to see the influence of these efforts upon Carthage and upon African society. A favourable time arrives, the Christians, under Philippus Arabs, are patronised and promoted. Cyprian, the Carthaginian Bishop, describes the result, —divisions, corruption of manners, the loss of discipline, manliness, faith. A persecution comes. Numbers, as might be expected, throw away that profession which they held so feebly; others make a compromise with

their consciences, and obtain credit for a crime which they have not committed. The picture is a sad one. It is relieved by instances of fortitude and endurance to death; by the tokens of the good which came to Carthage out of its sorrow; above all, by the proof Cyprian himself gave, in a pestilence which followed the persecution, that he had the sympathy of brotherhood with the heathen population, and could as readily lay down his life for them as for his own flock. Then follow endless debates and arrangements about the economy of the Church. When Constantine acknowledges it, he finds Africa beset by a schism which he must interfere, in vain, to heal. The schism grows stronger through the fourth century. In the course of that century we have Augustine's valuable help in ascertaining what the condition of Carthage and its neighbourhood was, when he was growing into manhood. The moral tone of the country, as he describes it, is miserably low; the schools are given up to a paltry rhetoric; everywhere we have the indications of an exhausted falling society, only here and there any symptom of renovation. The heart and mind of Augustine were themselves at work in the years after he returned to his native province, to fulfil these promises. But the Vandals were besieging Hippo when he died. Africa needed the terrible discipline they inflicted upon it. The wars of Justinian, by which they were expelled, thinned and wasted it; they did not apparently impart to it any fresh moral life. The fate of Antioch was awaiting Carthage. The Mussulman was to draw the same moral out of both. Only in the case of Carthage

one side of the moral was more conspicuous. The Christian teachers there, while they denounced, with righteous vehemence, the outrages on domestic life which the heathens perpetrated, had done little, except by their denunciations, to assert its sacredness. They had done something to *diminish* its sacredness. They had allowed it to be supposed that the divinest kind of life excluded it; that relationships were precious as types of something else; scarcely precious in themselves. The country which had derived its civilization from Rome, wanted the very principle from which Roman civilization had sprung. The Christian Church did not vindicate that principle in its inmost circle. Could it expect to make Carthage understand its own cardinal maxim, while this method of enforcing it was neglected? Must it not look somewhere or other for the hand-writing on the wall, to declare that it was weighed in the balance and found wanting? Where could that writing appear more legibly and terribly than on the scymitars of the Saracens?

There is another city, far richer and more various in its history than either Antioch or Carthage, of which I need not speak, as a friend of mine brought a number of its aspects before you in the course of the last spring. I am only reducing his pictures into a few dull words, when I say that the Church in Alexandria was able to maintain her ground against the philosophy which it had derived from Greece, even to match her policy with that of the Empire; that she was able to boast of her heroes and martyrs; but that she was not able to renew a decaying and putrifying carcase; that she was less able,

because she was so eager to confute sages and baffle statesmen, because she did not remember that she inherited from the Jew the duty and the power of raising family life, and through that, national life, from the abyss into which it had fallen. I must, therefore, agree with him in regarding it as a blessing, not a curse to mankind, that a better, truer, more manly and even more godly race was permitted for a while to tread under foot the Egyptian, as well as Syrian civilization.

It may be said, however, that these cities do not offer a fair ground for experiment, seeing that they had already so stiff and stereotyped a form of social existence. At all events, Byzantium is open to no such objection. It had no historical associations; it was surrounded with no ancient and venerable Pagan traditions. It offered itself, by its magnificent site, to the eye of the first Christian emperor, as the fittest place of all to bind the two continents under one master. Rome, in the days of Diocletian, had already lost its dignity as the seat of the Cæsars; the contrivance of dividing the world under several Princes had failed, at least for the moment. What a glorious opportunity for casting aside the tyranny of the gods who had claimed the Italian capital as their home! What an edifice may not a Christian monarch and Christian bishops raise on the foundation of the new faith! They undertake the task. No skill or zeal or treasures are wanted to bring it to rapid completion. What is the result? The child is decrepit from its birth; has all the signs of advanced age in its cradle. It springs at a bound into the corruptions which other cities attain by gradual

accretions, by a long process of degeneracy. The vilest parasites at once acquire a recognised dominion in the palace. Titles take the place of orders; offices of relations. There is a complete system; there is no life. No one thing cleaves to another by a law of internal affinity; only by an accidental, artificial attachment. What signifies it how you describe such a society as this? Who cares whether you denote the different parts of it by ecclesiastical, or civil, or military names? They mean the same thing; they belong equally to a huge Oriental despotism. You have, indeed, succeeded in making a capital altogether different from the old, divested of its perilous recollections. But the difference is, that all which spoke there, even in the darkest times, of internal greatness and strength and freedom, has been exhausted,—that the imperial falsehood has attained the consummation at which it had always been aiming, but which it never reached.

It would be a mournful and utterly false inference from these premises, that during the 1,000 years in which Constantinople dragged on a precarious existence as a Christian capital, there did not come from it any noble men, any illustrious words and deeds, any treasures of thought and experience which the world could not have afforded to lose. All such let us cheerfully and thankfully acknowledge, wondering at the creative power which can bring life out of death, order out of that which appears to us worse than chaos. Let it, for instance, be always remembered how, before Valens fell in his battle with the Goths at Hadrianople, Ulphilas had gone forth as the teacher of those Goths

who had been settled in the empire. He went to tell them what he believed and what he knew. There might be confusions in his mind; there might be greater confusions when his lessons passed into the minds of his pupils. There they met various and dim traditions with which they strangely mingled, together with a fierceness which often turned them to its own purposes and imparted to them its own likeness. But anyhow they received that which they had most need of, and they received it, as they probably would not have done from a Latin. Ulphilas would have told them first and chiefly, of a Brother of their race to whom they might look up with wonder and trust. The book he rendered into their tongue seemed all full of these tidings. And with that he put into their own Mæso-Gothic, words which travelled through the length and breadth of Europe, and penetrated into all dialects, and gave them a unity with each other, as they testified of a like unity between huts and palaces: 'Our Father, which art in Heaven.'

This was indeed a mighty contribution to the Christian civilization of the West. There were many others only less memorable. The gathering together of Roman laws by Justinian,—the architecture in which Byzantium instructed Venice and many cities not in Italy,—her scholars and antiquarians, who watched carefully over the deposits of past ages, if they could not create for themselves,—the final testament of her treasures to the Latin world, when she could no longer preserve her own life from the Turk,—must always be thought of with gratitude. But on the other hand, Constantinople

testified how little she ever grasped any one of the great principles or institutes of Humanity; how little, above all, she could ever appreciate a fatherly government. The sight of the hateful abuses of her palace helped more than anything else to inspire Julian with his hatred of Christianity,—to make him think that the old gods might be the restorers of the old world. The emperor and empress, and the bishops who executed their commands, drove the noblest and best of the citizens of Constantinople—Chrysostom—into exile. It was in her that the frightful spectacle was presented to mankind, of the most furious religious factions joined with the most utter frivolity; the holiest names, at which angels are said to veil their faces, mingling with the shouts of the circus; the same diabolical passions being associated with the one and the other. What true life, what higher civilization could come from such a religion as this? It might be the shell of the highest truths; but the kernel was gone out of it. It was a religion that had set itself in the place of Man and of God.

We turn, therefore, anxiously and earnestly, with some hope but more of fear, to that old city which was not built in a day, which did not rise at the wand of any imperial magician, but which appeared as if it were an integral portion of the old world and could not survive its dissolution. Has it been dissolved? Can it endure the revolution which is shaking not the earth only which it has ruled, but the heaven in which dwelt the objects of its adoration? This is the question which men were asking when the hosts of Alaric appeared at

the gates of the city, which they had to ask themselves again and again through all the convulsions of the fifth century. The answer at first appeared decisive. The Western world was seemingly hastening to decomposition, faster than the Eastern. The swarms which flew over the one settled on the other. Every fresh blast of the trumpet announced more clearly than the last that the work of ages was about to suffer some tremendous fall. At length an event comes, which is scarcely worthy of that name. The light that has been flickering so long, bursting out for a moment, then growing feebler and feebler, dies in the socket. History amuses itself with finding a nickname for the Cæsar out of whose hand the sceptre dropped. In bitter mockery he is called Romulus Augustulus.

The catastrophe seems to have arrived. In a little time the Ostrogoth succeeds. A fresh and vigorous race is clothing itself with the spoils of the dead giant. But is he dead? Is not the pulse still beating? Are there not symptoms, not of life only, but of strength; of strength that may become once again mighty for good or for evil? I do not now refer to the armour which the Goth is wearing, to the laws and institutes which he gradually begins to find necessary for him. I must consider hereafter whether these were forged by him, or inherited from the Roman. But another, stranger, more startling fact offers itself to us. The masters of the greater part of Italy do not make the old capital their capital. *That* is left to one who calls himself its Father. The name has been long heard: now that the Emperor is gone, it becomes THE name; the power

which Rome claims as characteristic of itself. In the deepest suffering and degradation this power makes itself felt. Gregory the Great finds Rome in an abyss of misery which it had never reached in any former age; impoverished by the wars of Belisarius, crushed by pestilence, threatened by Lombards, hopeless of assistance from Greeks. By a government really fatherly, by proving that he does not value his power for its sake or his own, he lifts his country out of ruin. He aspires to make all the nations of the West confess the same authority. To a marvellous extent he accomplishes his purpose. A society composed of different tribes and races once more does homage to the ancient capital. A paternal authority is now, as at the first, declared to be the ground of its dominion.

This is the fact to which I drew your attention when at the commencement of my Lectures I quoted the passage of Dante which speaks of Æneas and old Roman life as having some mysterious relation to the successors of St. Peter. I accepted the assertion. I said, I believed we should find it to be true. I maintained that there had been a marvellous continuity in the history of this people, and that it was one which deserved our deepest study, for the light it threw upon the Providence which guides all nations, and the special help it afforded in understanding the civilization of the Western world.

I am no more afraid to meet the facts which encounter us at this stage of our inquiry, than those which thrust themselves upon us at the outset of it. I no more dare to suppress one portion of history lest it

should be claimed as an argument against Protestantism, than I dared to suppress another, lest it should appear to reflect some honour upon Paganism. In all suppressions there is unbelief, there is sin, there is treachery to the maxims which our Christian and Protestant forefathers have bequeathed to us. They bade us go up to every fact, look it in the face, question it till it tell us what it means. So act the brave students of the phenomena of nature; so must we behave ourselves in the presence of the phenomena which perplex us in the life of nations and of men. When we come first to the mouth of the cavern, there may rise up dark vapours; confused sounds may be heard through them; when they take form as distinct words, the oracle may be ambiguous, bewildering, self-contradictory. But wait on as those wait who care to know; watch as those watch who believe that the morning will come out of the darkest night. You will find that the answer proceeds from no mad or false priestess, but from the Spirit of Truth, who will Himself enable us to understand it, who Himself will direct the fulfilment of it.

LECTURE IV.

THE INFLUENCE OF ROME AND GERMANY UPON MODERN EUROPE.

THE name of one of your eminent countrymen is inseparably associated with the notion, that the Roman world passed away in the fifth century, and that the origin of modern society is to be sought for in the woods of Germany. I have no need to tell you that this doctrine has been strongly controverted in our day, and that the tide of opinion is setting in the opposite direction. The permanence of Roman institutions, their prodigious influence upon the life and society of the Middle Ages, have been asserted by the most eminent historical scholars of France, Germany, and Great Britain. The very forms of social life which Robertson traced to a Gothic source, have been said to bear most distinctly the Latin impress.

You, I conceive, are particularly qualified to be arbiters in this controversy. Respect for your distinguished historiographer may make you unwilling to dissent from any opinion which had the sanction of his authority; yet you, far more than we in the south, have most

practical witnesses in favour of the other theory. Your jurisprudence is so intimately associated with the civil law, that no affection for Saxon ancestors can tempt you to disclaim your obligations to Rome. Those benefits which it requires some pains and ingenuity to bring home to us, which we have thought it rather a part of our pride to repudiate, must be continually forcing themselves upon your notice. You do not want Savigny or Guizot to show you, that if Rome died with Romulus Augustulus, some of the most important of her rules and maxims are alive at this day.

At the same time you may, I think, entertain a reasonable doubt whether the dogma of our century necessarily displaces that which prevailed in the last. So far as that was negative, so far as it intimated the utter passing away of the old polity and its effects, we may be content to abandon it. Possibly, we may go a little further. We may perceive that Rome was especially the land of institutions, that in the strict sense of the word, our venerable Saxon ancestors knew little about them; and that, therefore, in distributing our gratitude to those who have earned it, we may fairly give the former, and not the latter, credit for these particular treasures. But, on the other hand, if we come to consider what institutions are, how any people become possessed of them, what they do for us and cannot do, we shall look with considerable suspicion upon some of the statements to which the recent school has given currency, highly as we may honour their facts and the industry which has brought them to light. We may turn with some affection to the other conclusion as

proceeding from a sound instinct, even if the premises from which it was deduced are not satisfactory. In M. Guizot's works on the civilization of Europe generally, and of France particularly, one discovers the widest and most minute acquaintance with all the documents that bear upon the subject, or can even remotely illustrate it,—a remarkable freedom from party bias,—a desire to do justice to all influences, from whatever quarter they have come, which have contributed to the formation of European society. All the agencies of great men, of customs, of laws, of race, of religion, are freely confessed, and their action and reaction upon each other clearly and beautifully explained. What one misses, I think, in the admirable picture, is precisely that primary element of civilization to which I have been trying to draw your attention in these Lectures. All these diverse conspiring or contradictory powers were at work to create something very real, something which all history bears witness of, something which is implied in the very existence of cities and polities, something which cannot perhaps be denoted by any better name than that which he has chosen. But when one tries to connect the citizen with the man, when one recollects that he was certainly a son, probably a husband and father and brother, as well as an exerciser of municipal rights, a holder of property, an artist, or a man of science, it seems to us as if this point had been overlooked, as if the accomplished teacher had thought it too commonplace to demand any special attention from one who was engaged in so difficult and complicated an inquiry. Not, of course, that he would not at once

assent to the importance of domestic life, or confess that all the other parts of life might be affected by the good or bad condition of it, but that he never seems to have acknowledged these to himself as the root of all civilization, and all civilization—let it have reached the highest point it will—as irregular and tortuous, as tending to destruction, and as needing a new start and commencement, when it has forgotten this origin and is contemplating arts, refinement, religion, without reference to it.

It is easy to understand how a great thinker, dreading, on the one hand, the idolatry of savage,—that is, merely independent or individual,—existence into which so many reformers in the last century fell,—dreading not less the notion that there was in the middle ages a kind of patriarchal life separated from the life of cities, which it would be desirable to reproduce,—should have made what appears to us so serious an omission. Looking upon his book as a protest against either of these opinions, it is of the highest value. But if it tempts us to think of that life which Tacitus has described, as merely savage,—if it hinders us from seeing that out of this life proceeded that which Rome could not give, and which alone made what she did give of any worth,—I conceive we are defrauded of a truth, for which the additional light we have acquired on a number of points is no sufficient compensation. Take away what we owe to our German forefathers, and our institutions would mean something altogether different to us; they would have been imposed upon our nation, not, as they have, grown up with it, their bone and muscle

adapting itself to its inner life and outward occasions, strengthening daily with use and exercise.

What I said in my last Lecture in reference to Agricola and his influence upon Britain, will at once explain this distinction. The institutions which he introduced into the province, were as good as the wisest and most benevolent ruler could devise for those whom he ruled. There was no grudging disposition to withhold from subjects that which belonged to their masters. What Romans felt to be best for themselves, — roads, markets, magistrates, equitable administration, restraint upon crime,—they freely gave. The population was capable of the boon; the Druids, who would have hindered them from receiving it, were swept away. In due time came Christianity travelling with the Roman legions, settling in the country first as a proscribed stranger and outlaw, finally as an acknowledged and honoured guest. Why did a society with so many pillars inside of it, tremble the moment the external buttress of imperial protection was withdrawn? M. Guizot explains, that as the central government grew feeble and necessitous, those who held municipal offices in the provinces were liable to the severest responsibilities and exactions, —that it was therefore a privilege to be exempt from them,—that the middle class, which is formed by municipal institutions, was enfeebled and almost destroyed. These, no doubt, are important facts; a colony in this condition must be a falling one. But we Britons have felt that to continue a Province or a Colony, supposing municipal institutions had been ever so respectable, taxes ever so moderate, would have meant the never emerging

into the dignity of a nation, the never sharing in its common sufferings and joys, its shame and its triumphs, the never being in the right sense freemen or citizens. We have considered it is a cause for continual thanksgiving, that our civilization was swept away; that our Christianity was driven into corners; that a Pagan and a barbarous race got possession of our fields and of our harbours. Why, but because these bloodthirsty men,—over whose coming Gildas the monk poured forth such wailings, while he confessed, at the same time, that the moral condition of Britain was utterly bad, that order and family life had perished, that it was the prey of continual tyrants,—because this bloodthirsty people had the sense of kindred, a belief in the sacredness of relationships, an acknowledgment of divinities, such as I spoke of in the last Lecture, who were concerned in the preservation of these, and were interested in putting down the evil giants that were destroying the earth. Was it not well, we have said to ourselves, to get these men fixed on our soil, whatever temporary miseries they might inflict upon it, because they were not effeminate colonists who submitted to an order which was forced upon them, reluctantly but slavishly,—gratifying their inclinations at the expense of law when they dared, but, on the whole, keeping the sepulchres fairly white, while the dead men's bones were rattling within;—but men full of all turbulent and disorderly impulses, men, nevertheless, panting for order, longing to find some real government that they might both obey and love, having already the pattern of it in the homes to which their hearts turned amidst all their barbarism, in the Gods,

who were at least more kingly and more observers of laws than themselves?

This has been our conviction, and I do not think we are prepared to give it up. We may have pushed it further than the facts permitted: we may have assumed that our law and polity could not have had anything to do with the country, which had ceased to rule us when the Saxons brought their wives and children here. We may have forgotten that four centuries of Roman occupation must have left the deep traces of themselves in every direction, as we know that they have in the actual soil and in the names of our towns. We may have failed to consider that the Saxons, rude men as they were, were still a tractable people, who recognised facts, and who, therefore, if they saw any Roman practice, the reasonableness of which they could appreciate, which clearly did the work it was intended for, and which they could connect with their own more primitive notions of fatherhood and brotherhood, would be likely to adopt it and remould it.

But the discovery and confession of these mistakes will not hinder us from speaking, as we have always spoken, of the Saxons as the beginners of our national history. Though the phrase may appear to be chronologically improper, we are certain that it is radically sound. And it is not inconsistent with chronology, or with any facts whatever, if it be true, as I have contended in these Lectures, that the civilization of Rome, just as much as the Gothic civilization, had its starting point in the household. For then it might surely be most needful that the household life and strength should

be restored, before any of the gifts which Rome had conferred could be really available for us.

It does not signify from what country we fetch our illustrations. I have taken England rather than any continental country, rather even than Scotland, not because it is the easiest and most obvious instance,—for in some respects it is the most difficult,—but because it brings so many of the questions we are considering together, and submits them to so severe a test. The interruption of our earliest Christianity by the Saxon settlement distinguishes our history most curiously from the French, who became so much more closely connected with the Church, after the invasion of Clovis, than they had been before. And it is idle to overlook the fact that our Christianity was recovered from a Roman source, that the Christian civilization of the Saxons began with Gregory. I cannot for a moment doubt that the mission of Augustine in England was immensely furthered by that proclamation, which fell so dead on the ears of the Celts in Wales, or rather which called forth in them so much suspicion that the habits and practices they had received from their fathers were to be disturbed and set aside by a foreign authority. Honest and even useful as the opposition of those earlier Christians was, it cannot be disputed that the name of a spiritual father went home to the hearts of our kings, their wives, and their people, and that the demand of obedience to such a one was responded to, as no mere announcement of a doctrine would have been. And this was because the associations with this name, the associations of hearth and home, were so alive and

vigorous in the Saxon race. When their minds were awakened to feel they had to do with a mysterious and invisible world, no tidings could be credible to them which did not connect that world with what they felt to be highest and holiest in this. Their vision of a spiritual ruler living hundreds of miles away over the sea, could not have been very distinct; but it suggested the thought of that which was immeasurably higher and also nearer. The call to obey such a ruler having such a name, the news of their own connexion with a large human family, met thoughts which had been working confusedly in them for generations, which their mythology had sometimes kindled, often bewildered, but never satisfied.

The history of the very gradual conversion of these Saxons is always intertwined with their national and with their family life, with the relation of the king to the subject, but with that as it grew out of and was interpreted by the relations of the father to the child, of the husband to the wife. A society formed in this manner was likely, when it sought to draw others within its circle, to follow the same method. It can cause us no surprise that our Missionaries of the eighth century, who went forth to christianise and civilize their kindred stock in Germany, should have spoken much of a spiritual father of Christendom, and should have held the Churches they founded in very strict subjection to his authority. But another fact must be remembered in connexion with this. When the rapid growth of monasteries and schools in England had led to a severance between the religious life and

the domestic, when kings had acquired the habit of exchanging the crown for the cowl, and the whole of that society, which had been grounded upon the dignity and divinity of human relationships, was beginning to treat them as a Greek or an Oriental might, that civilization was swept away even as the former had been. The old kinsmen of the Saxons came to reclaim the land for paganism and barbarism; in other words, to confer on it the very same blessing which was conferred on it when the first set of sea-pirates conquered it,—the blessing of a healthy manly growth from a real root, the blessing of being delivered from that which was becoming every day more artificial, spurious, insincere.

I am carrying out, you perceive, the principle which I announced in my last Lecture. I cannot venture to speak of great events, like the Mahometan conquest in the East, like our own overthrows by Pagan conquerors, as if they were mere unintelligible breaks in the development of the modern world. I am bound to regard them as indispensable to that development; as monstrous calamities indeed in themselves, but as calamities without which one could not in the least understand the nature or trace the course of Christian civilization. It is the most familiar of all commonplaces, that we could not have had an Alfred without the Dane; and that commonplace ought not to signify merely that trials are necessary to bring forth a hero: but that Alfred's work, as the restorer of the true Saxon life,—of that homely, manly, kingly life which joined the world without to the world within, the student to the worker,—was substituted for that mixture of barbarism and effeminacy

which had divided the land between them. We see how a nation really grows, and how blessed are all those impediments which the providence of God raises to its over-rapid and tortuous growth; how merciful it is when it is obliged to spell out its elements again, to work at its hornbook, when it has been aspiring to lore for which it was not yet fitted, and which it could but acquire crudely and incoherently.

These events may seem too national and isolated for a summary of European civilization. I do not think they are so. I believe it is by the progress of some particular people, especially if that progress has been apparently irregular, that we must learn the law which has been at work everywhere. I believe we might deduce, for instance, from the case of Alfred, some very important conclusions respecting the union of Roman and Teutonic elements, and respecting the Christian influence which was fusing them together in the mind of every monarch who was able to raise and reform a land, to make it conscious of its calling, to connect it with the past, to prepare it for the future. But I willingly pass on to a period which manifestly connects us with the general history of Europe, and which illustrates, better perhaps than any other, the combined operations of those influences which we often assume to be hostile.

M. Thierry has given us a lively picture of the miseries which the Norman conquest inflicted on the old occupiers of the English soil. I do not wish to dispute the truth of his sketch, or even to lower the colouring of it. I cannot conceive how a people, fallen, as the Anglo-Saxons of the eleventh century certainly were, into

feebleness, strife, and sottishness, could have escaped the severest punishments, either at their own hand, or from some external invader. But if these brilliant narratives were to suggest the thought that the conquest was not on the whole an inconceivable blessing to England,—that it did not organise the form of society which was needful for the land then and for its after growth, —that it did not give us national consistency as distinct from the rest of Christendom, and yet at the same time bring us into fellowship with the rest of Christendom,— that it did not open to the native Saxon a pathway to ultimate greatness, which he could never have found if he had been left to the quiet possession of his lands, —I must steadily protest against them as at variance with facts still more important than those upon which they have been grounded.

There are many aspects of the subject; I can but glance at one. It was natural enough that English annalists should speak of the feudal system, as belonging to the Norman Conquest, as even the creation of William. Strangely as that doctrine was opposed to notorious passages in the past European history, it had so much justification from the change which took place in the condition of the English proprietors, that even accomplished writers unawares encouraged it. Robertson, by referring to the customs which governed the distribution of lands, wherever the chiefs of the tribes who broke up the Roman empire settled, made all his readers feel that the special circumstances of England had called no new scheme of society into existence. Roman antiquarians, going

further back still, have shown that the soldiers of the Empire, and even of the Republic, to whom conquered lands were assigned, held them upon a tenure not different in kind from the feudal tenure. The more one reflects upon these different observations, and seeks to combine them, the more one feels that these arrangements followed a law of which Romans and Germans were alike the unconscious asserters and administrators; a law which proceeded from no arbitrary will, though a strong will might be needed to give it effect; a law which was, in fact, the restraint, the only possible restraint, upon the outbreaks of arbitrary power; a law which, more than any other, distinguishes the condition of the Western from that of the Eastern world. However one may dwell upon the incidents of the feudal system, it is impossible not to see that at the basis of it there was an acknowledgment of relationships, beginning from the highest lord and descending to the weakest vassal,—a chain of inter-dependencies, grounded upon the idea of the family, transferred from it to the camp, affecting through both the conditions of civil life. M. Guizot is no doubt perfectly right, in saying that this feudal order is not itself civilization. It is antecedent to the growth of cities, and may do much to check their growth. Yet we have no reason to think that in the Western world cities could have come into existence without it; we have every reason to think that their existence would have been a capricious and unhappy one when severed from this foundation.

Those two memorable centuries, the eleventh and twelfth, which include the period of strictly Norman

domination in England, are those from which one is to learn how the feudal and the Christendom life were related to each other, the abuses to which each was liable, the benefits which each bequeathed. They are the centuries in which the Normans exhibit their ancient spirit of adventure, no longer as pirates of the sea, but as the soldiers of Europe; as men united in a common bond with all the nations of the West, pledged to fight the battles of the West. It is the age in which those Normans went forth to drive the Greeks out of Italy; were themselves threatened by an Italian conspiracy, of which Leo IX. was the head; vanquished him, and submitted to him as their spiritual lawgiver and parent. They are the centuries in which the successor of Leo IX., Hildebrand, put forth the claim to be the spiritual father of the world in broader and clearer language than his predecessors had ever used, and on the strength of it asserted his right to set his foot upon the neck of kings. They are the centuries of the Crusades and of the Military Orders. They are the centuries in which Monasteries had greater power over Europe, than they ever had before or have had since. They are the centuries in which Latin more completely asserted itself as the one language of thought in the West, than it ever did before or has ever done since. They are the centuries in which even the strong Saxon tongue yielded to this conqueror in the schools, as it yielded to the Norman conqueror in the law courts. These are evidently all indications of the same class and kind. They are not merely contemporaneous as historical events; a common historical principle is denoted by them. Surely we are not wrong if we say that this common principle

is the one which we found in the very cradle of Roman life, which appeared to strengthen with its strength and became weaker with its weakness, the principle of the authority of the father, the principle of all social life as connecting itself with this, as unfolding itself out of this. Take any one of the points I have alluded to; do not merely glance at the surface of the story, but look into the heart of it, and see whether it does not bear witness of the same truth. How is it that William, who maintains his own will against the world, who does not submit to any practical interference with his dominion, nevertheless acknowledges that enormous claim of Hildebrand,—never thinks of disputing that there is such a father, to whom kings must bow? Evidently he feels that without such an authority, wherever it is lodged, the chain of mutual interdependence is broken. He can exact no homage unless he renders it. There must be some reserved authority beyond his own, spiritual and mysterious, but after all fatherly, or his own will be a tyranny, and be regarded as a tyranny. Despot as he is, we feel how vast a difference there was between him and his successor, a difference affecting all their relations to their subjects. It clearly consisted in this: that the one had the sense of responsibility to some power which he could not measure by material rules and maxims, that the other counted such a power to be a mere dream; what was not material, was for him nothing. Hence the scholar was utterly contemptible in his eyes. He could sometimes look with a clear humorous gaze into false pretensions, but the wisest and devoutest man was just as

odious to him as the hypocrite. Each monarch of our Norman dynasty, down to the last, under whose reign all relations were loosened, all invisible power disdained, and mere physical strengths measured themselves against each other, illustrates what there was in those fierce knights and kings which was ready to break out to the destruction of the land and of themselves, and also what an order there was hemming them in on every side, what a restraining power of bonds and affinities and responsibilities, all derived from the family principle, from the sense of a fatherhood which they themselves were to exhibit, and of a higher fatherhood to which they must stoop.

Look again at the Crusades. See how mighty the Military Orders were, when they went forth in the strength of this mutual relationship, confessing a fatherly authority in their own superior, and a higher fatherly authority over the whole of Christendom,—how much this called forth all the other virtues which they displayed; and how utterly detestable they became, what plagues to every nation, when the sense of this bond deserted them,—nothing but the courage which it had awakened, and the arms which that courage enabled them to turn to mischief and crime, being left to them. Look again at the Monasteries. Their effect upon European civilization no one gainsays. The monks did unquestionably drain lands and till them, bring gardens out of a waste, teach and subdue brutal natures. The names of fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters, were inseparably intertwined with their thoughts and their energies. In these names, while they had any reality,

they exercised influence and dominion; the moment they became dead names, the Order became corrupt; those who had established it mourned over it; those who had bowed to it mocked it. Carry the examination a little higher. Reflect on the acts of the different Popes, from Hildebrand onwards to the middle of the eleventh century. Judge them just as they were; 'Nothing extenuate, or set down aught in malice.' See how the best men in Europe, such men as Anselm, fled to their authority as a refuge from the tyranny of monarchs, and stoutly and earnestly maintained their allegiance to it, even to the sacrifice of their civil duty, not from selfish and ambitious motives, but to their own exceeding loss and suffering, really deeming that this was a protection for the poor and a witness against the force of arms. And then read the account of what they found when they came into direct contact with this fatherly government, of the intrigues and venality which prevailed at the sacred See, of the immense difficulty which they had in recognising the thing and the person they were looking for. Read the address of Bernard to his pupil Eugenius III. at the beginning of his treatise 'De Consideratione,' and observe how the reverence for the man to whom he bows with the most filial affection, alternates with wonder how one living amidst such a crowd of parasites and suitors, in such a web of complicated worldliness, should have any leisure for thought, any time to seek refreshment for his moral life. Read the conversation between John of Salisbury, the devoted friend of Becket, the antagonist of Henry II., with his old friend Adrian IV., and hear how plainly

he tells him that Churchmen generally looked upon Rome as the sponge which was drawing all their life blood to itself. Put these two opposing sets of facts together, and then judge how wonderfully that belief of a fatherhood for Christendom was sustaining itself, against contradictions scarcely less overwhelming than those which assailed the early Roman, when he clung with such tenacity to the faith of a fatherhood over the city.

If we distinguish the Roman from the German civilization, I have a right, after what I have said, to connect the general European history of *this* period with the former rather than with the latter. There was, it is true, even at this time, even where the Christendom spirit was most distinguished from the national, an impulse which drew men's thoughts away from Rome and fixed them upon Jerusalem. The influence of that counteraction should never be overlooked by the student of these centuries; it was wider and deeper than either the ordinary civil or ecclesiastical historian has perceived; it suggested continually the thought of a centre which was, at all events, not in the West. It brought out a sense of direct allegiance to One, who was higher than all popes, and of whose power the sepulchre witnessed more than the palace. But this does not affect the other assertion, that the properly Teutonic and national life, if not suspended, was at least overshadowed during these centuries. The German emperors were of course maintaining their fight against the popes; but the imperial feeling was further removed from the national,—was, on the whole, more hostile to it,—than

the papal. Between them lay, alternately the victims and the allies of one or the other, those Italian cities whose records form so interesting and so melancholy a chapter in the history of modern civilization. Civilized they were, in the strictest sense of the word. The city had attained all the refinement, the subtlety, the eagerness for political experiments, which belonged to the old republics of Greece. But the ground of the civic life, the family hereditary feeling, had become only a part of it,—only, therefore, an excuse for those factions which were ever mixing themselves with theories and maxims of government, and disturbing the peace of society. It is wonderful how much interest we are able to feel in conflicts, so stained with selfishness and crime as these are. It is, that we are sure there is a principle which is greater and deeper than the combatants knew of, one connecting the turbulence of factions with the freedom of Italy, and that with all the mystery of human crime and punishment and blessedness; that the union which the Florentine patriot perceived and embodied in his great poem between his individual affection, the sorrows of his own land, and the purpose of God for the universe, was not an imaginary but a real one for himself and for every one that tried to realize it.

The struggles of these Italian cities enable us to understand, and appreciate more thankfully, the steps by which our own towns acquired their national position and dignity. It is they which offered that new and better path to greatness which I spoke of, for our Saxon population; in them they learnt the meaning of their old privileges, the sacredness of their old municipal

freedom. The charters of the monarchs did not so much give them rights, as enable them to re-assert those which had been always latent in their constitution. They found that in their unions, as tradesmen, they could accomplish more than in their separate existence, as landowners; the skill of handicraftsmen was developed in them; they worked together as they had never worked in the days before the Norman ascendency; they became the middle class of England. They began to feel, that if they were not the head of the nation, they were at least its heart. They could vindicate it once more as *their* nation; they could prove that the Saxon tongue had never died, that it had only been strengthening itself with Norman and Latin grafts, and that it was stronger and more living than ever, more capable of expressing great thoughts and recording noble deeds. But this, which was our civilization, though it was altogether different from that feudal life which preceded it, though it rose up as a contrast to it and counteraction of it, had a wonderful affinity with its principle. We must not forget that the trading bodies in our towns were called fraternities—that the feeling of brotherhood, if it was derived from the monasteries, yet penetrated into the heart of these manufacturing communities, and gave the form to their municipal institutions. The name, no doubt, became limited by trade notions; it was often confined to those who did a particular kind of work. They might be rivals to those who did another work; there might be divisions between men of the same craft, opposing societies within it; there might be plentiful jealousies in each. Still, so

far as there was order, as there was civility, this name expressed the ground and the support of it. Only so far as this name suggested its primary meaning, did this class become a powerful and united one, able to show that the burgher might do as much as the noble or the knight, in maintaining the unity as well as the freedom of the land.

And it must be remembered, that the burgher was a plain man who did not care for metaphors. A father meant a father to him, a brother a brother. There was a general comprehensive use of the words, which he held to be real and sound. But there was also a special and natural application of them. In his mind the one must always keep up its connexion with the other. The actual family with its actual relations must be maintained. Any thing which assumed relationship and made light of this, he soon learnt to regard with indifference, even with hostility. The monk and the friar, therefore, however they might be endured by the highest class, reverenced by the lowest, were always viewed by him with something of jealousy and aversion. For the upper clergy, as removed from sympathies with common life, he had little regard; the secular clergy, the parsons of the towns, were his guides and teachers. They were English, and grew more English by their association with him. He forgave them for being celibates; but he could not understand why such a restriction had been imposed on them, and regarded with suspicion and dislike those who had invented it.

I am describing a class which you will at once recognise as belonging both to England and Scotland,

the class which sympathised with the movement of Wycliffe and received his translation of the Bible as their book, dear to them as the pledge of their national existence, the witness that a divine voice was speaking directly to them and their kings, not at second-hand through any vicegerent. But indications similar to these, though not the same, were to be seen in all the Teutonic nations during the fourteenth century; adapting themselves to the previous habits and feelings of the countries in which they arose; everywhere having the same origin, giving rise to the same murmurs, leading onwards to the same results. The trade fraternities,—the awaking in them of a peculiarly domestic feeling and a peculiarly national feeling,—their conspiracy against the hierarchy which boasted of being universal,—these belong, at least, to all the northern nations of Europe at this period; under certain considerable modifications, probably to the Latin nations also. But from the character of the movement, it must be contemplated in each separate country; the attempt to represent it as I did the Christendom movement of the former time, must fail.

In the fifteenth century the scene is changed. Then we see again a general European impulse at work; but at work in the Latin countries more than in the Teutonic, among the scholars far more than among the people. It is apparently an impulse, even a vehement impulse, towards reformation. The great Latin councils cry out that there is corruption both in the head and in the members. They undertake to set things right by such means as they know of, arguing about maxims of

ecclesiastical and state government, drawing wonderfully subtle distinctions, ready to make strong decrees, though there is some danger that the one of to-day may contradict that of yesterday. What it strikes one that the learned doctors of these councils have not discovered, is, that the corruption which they saw appearing both in head and members, was a corruption of the blood, which no amputation of limbs, no substitution of the best and most flexible wooden or cork limbs for those which should be cut off, was likely to remove. A deep, pervading, penetrating immorality in ecclesiastics as much as in laymen,—a low, grovelling moral habit, which was worse than the acts that proceeded from it,—these present themselves to every student of that period, and if he is a true and earnest man, make him loathe the controversies relating to external arrangements, which might have been altered and re-altered a thousand times, and left society just as it was before.

It is not wonderful that men have turned with satisfaction from this spectacle, to observe that other European movement of the time, which we describe by the name 'Revival of Letters.' It is not wonderful that Popes and dignified ecclesiastics, if they had some human sense and feeling, even though they had not the distinct political object of diverting men's thoughts from evils that were palpable and that seemed incapable of redress, should have thrown themselves eagerly into this movement, willingly forsaking the ecclesiastical questions for its sake. We have been wont to say that, in taking this course, they were doing their very best for the civilization of Europe. Recent writers have

somewhat vehemently contradicted that opinion, maintaining that the civilization which they were promoting, was at all events Pagan and not Christian,—that all which had been strong and Christian in the previous times, must now give way to the classical,—that the Greek and Roman standard of heroism was to displace the saintly ideal. Very strong feelings and very able intellects are enlisted on both sides in this strife. It is one which no person must omit to take notice of, who ventures to speak on the subject of these Lectures. But I am afraid that if I enter upon it, I must give almost equal offence to each party. I cannot fall down and worship Nicholas V. or Lorenzo the Magnificent, or Leo X. I can as little bring myself to regret the revival of Latin scholarship and Greek art, or not to hail it as a very great step forwards in the divine and moral education of the West. I cannot think that a mere dilettantism and refinement, which satisfied no one of the great national impulses that had been awakened in the fourteenth century, which did nothing whatever for the elevation of the mind of the people, which scorned the idea of liberty and popular life, which tolerated the basest intrigues and the darkest vices, which concealed them, apologised for them, and allied itself with them: I cannot conceive that this is a thing which brave men are bound to admire, or which they can dare to speak of, as if it had borne any great fruits for mankind. But on the other hand, I must think that this dilettantism, poor and contemptible in itself, was discovering or at least polishing weapons that were destined to do mighty service for mankind, and partly by work-

ing out its own destruction. Call the old literature Classical or Pagan, or what you please, but it was a literature that spoke of national life and energy, of polities that were based upon principles and not upon plots, of statesmen who were first men, of states that were called into being by a divine voice and which asserted their origin by the vengeance and fall which overtook the human rulers who supposed they could fashion the world at their pleasure. This literature, with all its corruptions, spoke more clearly and distinctly of domestic life as lying at the foundation of civil polity, than any monk, however high his ideal might be, had been able to speak. No doubt, these principles were so mixed with what contradicted them, that they needed some light to explain their meaning and clear away their perplexities. The new philology, in bringing the Scriptures out of the dust of the schools and setting forth their living, domestic, national records, —where all is clear, free, inartificial, earthly because heavenly, human because divine,—in contrast with the learned commentaries and popular legends, provided that light, sufficient for the guidance of the wayfarer who had none of the other lore, the revealer of its meaning and worth to those who had it. And therefore, though they thought it not, neither did it come into their minds, I believe those who patronised the new literature and the new art were doing much for that highest and truest civilization, which is not apart from national and domestic life, but of which they are the sources and guardians. If Raphael fell, as we are told he did, below elder painters in his standard of

devotion and holiness, I must think, without pretending to any knowledge of the subject, that he was not only more perfect than they were in his art, but that he did much more to raise the human and domestic affections, by exhibiting the purest model of them. I must think also, that it was better and more for the honour of God, that men should study the human form as He made it, whether they derived the impulse to that study from the Greeks or from any other people, than that they should reconstruct it according to notions and fictions of their own. Any passage out of the artificial to the living and the real must, I conceive, have been a passage towards moral health and reformation. And I cannot but think that a sound acquaintance with the heartier life of the old Romans, such as the revival in the fifteenth century enabled its students to obtain, must have suggested some very frightful and yet not altogether useless comparisons, with Rome as it was in the days of Alexander VI. and Cæsar Borgia. If the one was called Pagan civilization and the other Christian, the young man of that age might be tempted to prefer the earlier: but since he would do so because the New Testament had taught him that he was bound to hate what was clearly of the devil, and to refer everything which had in it the taste and savour of truth to God, one would hope that the conflict of mind, however terrible for a while, would at last bring him to love that book best which testified against all wrong, and most vehemently against that which assumed the divine livery and banner.

I have alluded to this contrast because I wish you

not to forget that my especial business is with Roman civilization. I began this Lecture with saying that I could not separate that from German civilization, though I looked upon them as distinct, markedly distinct, from each other. You will at once gather from my previous remarks, that I regard the German Reformation as a wonderful and blessed development of that principle, of which I traced the working in our own Saxon people. The more one feels the inefficiency of the attempts at Reform of the Doctors in the councils of Pisa and Constance,—the more heartily does one rejoice in that Reform which began from a moral ground; which appealed to the conscience of the people; which advanced vigorously and triumphantly so long as it was broad, homely, national, so long as it was bearing witness against the abominations of ecclesiastical practice, so long as it was vindicating the sacredness of marriage and family life, so long as it was tearing down every veil that obstructed the vision of an actual Brother and Lord of men's spirits, so long as it rested all earthly duties and obligations on a divine ground, making them the result and carrying out of the Will which rules the universe. I need not remind you that the greatest obstruction to their progress, in the judgment of the Reformers themselves, arose from the fanatics who sought to overthrow the reverence for relationships, and to build up a spiritual society which should dispense with them. I need not remind you that any blots which we lament over, and their adversaries triumph over, in their own acts, arose from their inability to vindicate the sacredness and dignity of these relationships as they desired to do,

or from some unworthy compromise with the errors and sins of their patrons. The result of the history, if one meditates on it thoughtfully and carefully, comparing it with that of previous and of subsequent times, is one of extreme wonder and thankfulness, that such a divine deliverance was effected for the world through the old Saxon faith and reverence, from a state of things which had become more utterly immoral heartless and godless than that of any period in the world's history,—except, possibly, the reigns of the first seven Cæsars. But in spite of this wonder and gratitude, one cannot but feel that something was wanting, which this German movement did not supply, something to combine with it and make it effectual. It seems as if the Latin nations could not profit by it, as they might have done, because the characteristic of the old Roman civilization,—the reverence for fathers,—was but feebly developed in it. This reverence had no doubt been very imperfect in these nations; but the recollection of it had been kept alive by the name of the general father of Christendom,—which they had been taught to associate with the very existence of the Church. It certainly needed to find some outlet and some fountain which the German teachers had but obscurely pointed out.

The period between the Reformation and the French Revolution would furnish, I think, plentiful confirmations and illustrations of this remark, if I had time to produce them. But I am anxious to dwell upon one fact which ought to increase our sense of our national blessings and responsibilities. That union of Roman and German civilization which has been granted to the

Scotch and English, and which prevents us from identifying ourselves with either class of the nations into which we commonly divide Western Europe, has imparted to us more of the old patriarchal feeling than belongs to the Protestant nations of the Continent; while, at the same time, we have kept up, perhaps more intensely than any of them, our conviction that it cannot be satisfied in the way in which the purely Latin nations are trying to satisfy it, and that though the fatherly principle may be expansive enough for the whole of human society, it never can exist while it is not owned as the root of a pure domestic life. The belief in that last truth,—in the inseparable connexion of the family with whatever is right, manly, godly, in the life of the citizen, —your ancestors, it seems to me, held more firmly than ours. So solemn a subject, affecting us individually as well as socially, ought to furnish an occasion for any thing rather than flattery. I am not consciously guilty of that sin when I use these words. For I speak them with the most earnest conviction of the obligation which is laid upon us one and all, not to dissipate such an inheritance if it has indeed come down to us; and of the possibility, which becomes more manifest the more we read history,—the more we consider our own times,—that we may suffer that great and infinite loss which other people have suffered, and may thereby be deprived of all the blessings which we claim in the names of Civilization and of Christianity. Before I conclude, I will illustrate my remark and the moral of it, from another and more recent page of history.

There probably never was a society so brilliant as that in France before the Revolution; none in which so many schemes of social life were discussed with so much lightness and gracefulness. There probably never was a time in which theorists dwelt so little upon the human relationships, in which the practical indifference to them was greater. Yet when the earthquake came which shook France and all the Latin nations, far more than the Revolution of the sixteenth century had shaken the German, the first word that one hears is the word Brotherhood; all men of all classes are to embrace each other as brothers. How they were to do so, no one could tell them; how brotherhood could be prevented from leading to mutual destruction, was a lesson which statesmen and philosophers had not learnt. The very name seemed to terrify them, as if it was one which they had never heard before, as if all disorder and destruction were involved in it. Still it did burst out of the hearts of the very lowest people. They had been taught other phrases and symbols which they could repeat and use occasionally; this was the one they clung to habitually; this lived on amidst the death of constitutions, lived on through the fires which it seemed itself to have kindled. It terrified us in England and Scotland, often perhaps frightened us out of all propriety and wisdom. But it did not exactly frighten us in the same manner as it did the people on the Continent. For by degrees the impression on our minds became stronger, that fraternity was not a bad thing in itself, that it was bad only because there needed something else to be joined

with it. Brotherhood seemed to us a poor and miserable thing if it was separated from Fatherhood. Our old Roman doctors had taught us that; we had found from a higher oracle what their dim and mysterious utterances signified, to what they were pointing. It did not, therefore, cause us any delight to see this belief of fraternity trampled under foot by a military tyrant; that might be necessary, might be beneficial on the whole for the world; at least it implied that there must be a universal society somehow, and that a great Will must rule it. But this kind of universal government, this kind of Will, looked to us very unsightly; *this* we thought we were bound to struggle with and put down.

That this obligation is still laid upon us, that we ought to encounter the evil principle which substitutes mere sovereignty for fatherly authority, in whatever form it embodies itself, against whatever persons it puts forth its proud and godless pretensions, we are all, I trust, convinced. We feel that we ought to show all the tribes of the earth, that the true fatherly principle, instead of involving abject slavery, is the ground of all morality, of reciprocal rights and duties, of justice, of freedom. We perceive that this service is due to the Latin people of the West, who should belong to the same Christendom and Family as ourselves; is due no less to the Mussulman, that we may teach him what is wanting to make him one of that family. We owe it, surely, even more to those who bow beneath our sceptre,—to those in all parts of the world who have found that there was no power in their arms or their

traditions to resist the Saxon energy and enterprise. Of these we have boasted enough. Must we not claim also the other portion of our inheritance? Must we not understand, whithersoever we go, that we are sent to the different races of the earth with a message, not that the West is to rule the East, not that British notions and traditions are to displace those in which they have grown up, but that the Malay and the Hindoo have a right to claim the same Father as the Roman and the Goth, because He has claimed them for His children? Beginning from the highest truth which the old Roman saw dimly through his family institutions, and proclaiming it simply and broadly as it was proclaimed by those who overthrew the Roman Pantheon and laid the foundation of Christendom, we may be permitted to establish a domestic and a national life in countries where it has never existed, to restore it where it is withered and almost dead through the want of some sustaining principle. Thus we may exercise over an empire as wide as that of the Roman, the very influence which he needed to bind his provinces together, for the absence of which no arms and no laws could compensate.

We cannot despair of any nation of the world, though its condition may look ever so mournful from its barbarism, or its false and fading civilization, or its insincere religion, while we believe that there is in the highest Will an inexhaustible energy which is always at work to create and to regenerate. But we shall despair for all nations, we shall despair for ourselves, if we believe

that any machinery secular or religious, that any benevolence or wisdom of ours, can quicken human society generally, can quicken any,—the most fortunate,—portion of it. Whilst we cherish that delusion, no distant vision will look so ghastly and terrible as that which is daily before our eyes. The thought of our own population will mock us, defy us, madden us, more than the thought of the multitudes who worship Kali and Juggernaut. Before the actual dense wretchedness, physical and moral, of our streets, the appliances of states, the schemes and dogmas of philosophers and divines, are discomfited and put to flight. But no one experiment begun in the faith that there is a fatherly government over the world, no one attempt to prove that it exists and to connect it with human relationships, has failed. Its success has not fallen short of our dreams; it transcends them immeasurably. Every such experiment demonstrates that, if Christian men were as honest as the old Romans, and believed as much in the words that they speak, every household in the land might be as noble, because it might as fully realize the union between the divine and the human fatherhood, as that which has been made dear to the hearts of Scotchmen and of Englishmen by 'The Cotter's Saturday Night.'

It has been impossible not to recollect this great utterance of one of your own prophets, whilst I have been speaking of domestic and national greatness. And it has been difficult, while I have been speaking of the perpetuity of the Roman dominion under its different phases, not to think of another prophecy, a prophecy in

the more usual and modern sense of the word, which went out from your city, and which has awakened some speculations, possibly also some searchings of heart, on both sides of the Tweed, if not on the banks of the Tiber. You will easily suppose that I allude to an oracle which is stamped with the high authority of your representative. He looks forward to a time when an artist shall be sketching the ruins of St. Paul's from a broken arch of London Bridge. In that time he expects that the Vatican may still be standing in all its glory. There are those who have complained of this sentence, as unpatriotic, and as offering encouragement to those who hate us. I cannot join in that censure. I cannot conceive that a patriot has any higher duty than to remind his countrymen of the instability of their mere material greatness, to tell them that the buildings which bear witness of the extent and mightiness of their commerce may fall along with those in which they and their fathers have worshipped. Would to God that the image of that future painter rose oftener before us, to remind us that every single person in the crowds which are passing every hour and moment over London Bridge,—that every man who has knelt in St. Paul's before or since the fire,—has an immortality which does not belong to ships or towers or temples! The objection to Mr. Macaulay's words might have taken and may still take another form. If posterity does not deal more gently with that which our age leaves behind it, than we have dealt with the works of our forefathers, the critic of some distant period may affirm that one of our most illustrious

cotemporaries was so misled by his prejudices against the men of another nation and another faith, that he fancied he could persuade them,—with all the memorials of ruin before their eyes, with words that intimate the perishableness of all mortal things continually on their lips,—that the houses which they now inhabit have some special exemption from the general law, and that the palaces of popes will have a duration which has been denied to the palaces of emperors. We may be sure that there was no such uncharitable judgment or purpose, in the mind of the eloquent writer when he gave forth these sentiments. We may take it for granted that he only wished to impress us, by a contrast which would strike us as more vivid and startling than any other, with a lesson respecting ourselves which we have all need to lay deeply to heart. You would not feel that he diminished his claims upon your esteem—you would feel that he augmented them—if he told you,—perhaps he has told you already, in words which you cannot forget,—that even your city, notwithstanding its grand associations with the forms of nature and with the records of history, though every old and modern street in it reminds you of warriors with sword and pen who have fought your battles, may suffer that sentence which the greatest cities of the world have suffered. If a stranger who has no claim to speak to you at all but that which your kindness has given him,—yet who is bound by that kindness, by reverence for your past history, by strong affection and gratitude to many of your living citizens, to say not what is pleasant but what is true,—should

venture to recal that thought to your minds, he would do so in the full conviction that neither Rome nor London nor Edinburgh will be suffered to fall, or to lose any portion of its grandeur, till its work is done; till He who knows all things shall perceive that it is concealing the prospect of *the* Eternal City, in which Italians, Englishmen, Scotchmen, shall find then, may find now, their common home, their Father's house.

NOTES.

Note I. Page 211.

A very able and interesting article, on the Study of History, in the Westminster Review for October last, contains a statement respecting the coincidence of Roman greatness with a belief in utter falsehoods nearly identical with that in the text. I had not read this paper at the time I wrote the Lecture. I recommend it to the serious consideration of the historical student, both for its substantial merits, and because it is the best exposition of the opinion which I have endeavoured to refute. I would acquit the accomplished author of any indifference to truth; I believe he loves it heartily; though I feel that if I adopted his conclusion, I should despair of ever finding it, and should regard the whole universe as a great lie.

Note II. Page 211.

The passage from Niebuhr's letter, which I took from Miss Winkworth's excellent translation, will be found in vol. ii. pp. 385, 386, of the German Life. The passage stands thus in the original:—

'Wenn man an die alten Römer zurückdenkt, welche eine Religion der reinsten Wahrhaftigkeit, der Treue und Redlichkeit beherrschte:—das kommt einem hier am allerwunderlichsten vor. Wird es mir ja möglich meine Geschichte fortzusetzen, so werde

'ich es wagen, zeugniss zu geben, wie diese Religion, die ganz 'etwas anderes als Stoicismus war, die Grösse der alten repub-'licanischen Zeit begründet hat, und das ganze Leben der Ver-'fassung von ihr abhing.'

NOTE III. Page 213—218.

The passages from Savigny to which I have referred will be found in his 'System des heutigen Romischen Rechts,' book ii. chap. i. § 53, (especially pp. 341, 342, of vol. i. of the Ed. 1840;) and in the whole of § 54, (especially pp. 350 and 351, with the notes F. and G.)

NOTE IV. Page 231.

The passage from Ovid is in the Fasti, book vi. l. 267, beginning—

'Vesta eadem est quæ terra.'

NOTE V. Page 258.

I have not done justice to the book On the Nature of the Gods, nor to the part which Cotta plays in it, in that I have not quoted the very remarkable passage in Chapter xxxii. of Book I.; in which he makes the all-important distinction between the notion that the gods are made in the image of men, and that men are made in the image of the gods. I do not know many modern authors in whom one can find five lines of such pregnant theology as these: 'Nec 'vero intelligo, cur maluerit Epicurus deos hominum similes dicere, 'quam homines deorum. Quæres, quid intersit. Si enim hoc illi 'simile sit, esse illud huic. Video; sed hoc dico, non ab hominibus 'formæ figuram venisse ad deos: dii enim semper fuerunt; nati 'numquam sunt, si quidem æterni sunt futuri; at homines nati: ante 'igitur humana forma, quam homines, ea, qua erant forma dii im-'mortales. Non ergo illorum humana forma, sed nostra divina 'dicenda est.'

I would also invite the reader's attention to the very beautiful

passage, in which Cotta argues that Epicurus necessarily undermined Worship, however he might appear to cultivate it, when he divorced the idea of the gods from the idea of grace and love: 'Quum enim 'optimam et præstantissimam naturam dei dicat esse, negat idem 'esse in deo gratiam. Tollit id, quod maxime proprium est optimæ 'præstantissimæque naturæ. . . . . Vos autem quid mali datis, quum 'in imbecillitate gratificationem et benevolentiam ponitis! Ut enim 'omittam vim et naturam deorum: ne homines quidem censetis, nisi 'imbecilli essent, futuros beneficos et benignos fuisse? Nulla est 'caritas naturalis inter bonos? *Carum* ipsum verbum est amoris, ex 'quo amicitiæ nomen est ductum; quam si ad fructum nostrum 'referemus, non ad illius commoda, quem diligimus, non erit ista 'amicitia, sed mercatura quædam utilitatum suarum. Prata et arva 'et pecudum greges diliguntur isto modo, quod fructus ex eis 'capiuntur: hominum caritas et amicitia gratuita est. Quanto igitur 'magis deorum, qui nulla re egentes et inter se diligunt et homini-'bus consulunt.'

The author of these sentiments represents the doctrine—if it has a representative among Cicero's friends, or honest men—that all religions are equally false to the Philosopher, and equally useful to the Magistrate!

Note VI. Page 262.

I have preferred to give my total impression of the Book on Divination rather than to quote a number of distinct passages. The one which I have quoted, from the close of the second book, must not be taken as representing the spirit of the treatise, but rather as qualifying and controlling the sentiments which both the Ciceros had uttered in the course of it. It is clear that Cicero had utterly lost faith in divinations, but that there was something in divination which he felt to be indispensable to the state, not because it was false, but because it was true. He may have often hesitated himself whether this was his reason. He may often in worse moods have attributed to himself another. But there is a Philip sober to whom we may always appeal from Philip drunk, a man and therefore a statesman, who is always better than the politician.

Note VII. Page 263.

The memorable passage respecting the impossibility of thanking the Gods for the gift of virtue, is found in 'De Nat. Deorum.' lib. iii. c. 36.

Note VIII. Page 265.

See 'Republic,' lib. i. c. 36. I do not see any proof that the passage in Lactantius was derived from this chapter. If it was, the quotation was made by the Christian Father for a purpose which might not be Cicero's purpose. It is surely much safer, therefore, to adhere to the original, however imperfect and mutilated it may be. To my mind it proves that the King and Father of whom Scipio speaks is more than the sole monarch to whom the different philosophers quoted by the African divine are said to bear witness.

Note IX. Page 271.

It is scarcely necessary that I should urge the reader to turn for himself to the passage from Lucretius, of which I have given so bald a version. It is contained in the lines between 342 and 370 of the second book.

'Præterea genus humanum,' &c.

Note X. Page 327.

Fleury reports the conversation between the Pope and John of Salisbury (taking his narrative from the latter) with the malicious pleasure of a Gallican. See Histoire Ecclésiastique, liv. xvi. c. 15, A.D. 1156.

THE END.

R. CLAY, PRINTER, BREAD STREET HILL.

00111222

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 26 March, 2016